$1.50 PER ANNUM. APRIL, 1887. PRICE 15 CENTS.

Shakespeariana

VOL. 4 NO. 40

PHILADELPHIA; LEONARD SCOTT PUBLICATION CO.

MUTUAL RATES
—FOR—
PERIODICALS.

Mutual Library Co.

THIS AGENCY, ESTABLISHED IN 1877, NOW RANKS AS THE LARGEST IN THE COUNTRY.

Its facilities for furnishing any Journal are unequaled, its responsibility unquestioned. Checks received upon any Bank in the World. Numbered Receipts are given for every remittance.

OUR MUTUAL RATES ARE LOWER THAN THE OLD CLUB RATES OF SMALLER AGENCIES.

Library Copies, Harper's, Century, Atlantic Monthly, etc., $2.50 Per Year.

48 PAGE CATALOGUES MAILED ON APPLICATION.

MUTUAL LIBRARY CO.
1104 WALNUT STREET.
PHILADELPHIA.

SAUVEUR SCHOOL, No. 1319 WALNUT Street. Lectures in German on Wednesday afternoons, by Mr. OTTO HELLER.

MR. OTTO HELLER WILL LECTURE to Clubs, Schools, etc., upon German literature, and other subjects in German. Address, SAUVEUR SCHOOL, 1319 WALNUT STREET, PHILADELPHIA.

STUDENTS OF BROWNING WILL FIND MUCH to interest and assist them in the little handbook, "Outline Studies of Robert Browning's Poetry,' published for the Chicago Browning Society, by Charles H. Kerr & Co. A complete classification of the entire works of the poet is made, arranged for the guidance of clubs and classes. In connection with this a sketch of the so-called "Browning Movement" is given, with a plan of the work, and the rules that govern the Chicago organization.—*Boston Transcript.*

Shakespeariana

268578 D 32 7 1

No. XL. APRIL, 1887. Vol. IV.

CONTENTS:

Biblical and Religious Allusions in *Richard II.*
ANNA E. HENION. 149
The Gunther Folio and Autograph. E. P. VINING. 154
Recent Shakespeare-Bacon Literature. W. H. WYMAN. . . 160
A SCHOOL OF SHAKESPEARE.
Henry IV.—Part I. WM. TAYLOR THOM. 166
SHAKESPEARE SOCIETIES.
The Norwich Shakespeare Club. 175
The Locke Richardson Shakespeare Club. 177
The Shakespearian Society of Seneca Falls. 179
THE DRAMA.
Verdi and *Otello*. 180
Shakespeare in Pantomime 182
Mr. Irving's Reading of *Hamlet* 185
Adapting Shakespeare. 186
REVIEWS.
Victor Hugo and Shakespeare. APPLETON MORGAN. . . 187
LITERARY NOTES. 194
MISCELLANY.
Richard III.—The New York School of Acting.—The name Shakespeare.—Madcap Harry and Sir John Popham.—A new Portrait. 198

Contributions on subjects within the scope of the magazine are desired, and will receive prompt attention and reply.

As SHAKESPEARIANA *holds a peculiar place among periodicals by reason of its unique design and special field, its greatest possible measure of usefulness and success cannot be reached without the co-operation of all students and lovers of Shakespeare and Shakespearian literature. It is asked therefore, that the members of Shakespeare Societies and Classes everywhere, will report their work and condition from time to time, and also any bits of Shakespearian news of interest, indulgently leaving their publication, of course, to the judgment of the editor, in view of the needs, opportunities and conveniences of the magazine. Address,*

EDITOR OF SHAKESPEARIANA,
1104 Walnut St., Phila.

PHILADELPHIA:

LEONARD SCOTT PUBLICATION COMPANY,

1104 WALNUT STREET.

Shakespeariana

A Monthly Magazine devoted to Shakespearian Literature, Study, News, and Dramatic Criticism.

ESTABLISHED 1883. —— $1.50 A YEAR.

ITS MAIN FEATURES ARE:

Leading Articles.

Short, original papers on Shakespeare and kindred subjects.

A School of Shakespeare.

A department regularly maintained, offering advice and suggestions on the liberal educational study of Shakespeare.

☞ Courses now in progress are study of *The Merchant of Venice*, and Professor Taylor Thom's *Shakespeare Historical Reading*, beginning with *King John*, and continuing with the following English historical plays.

Open Court.

Miscellaneous correspondence, Scholars' notes and memoranda, inquiries and answers on difficulties in study, on biographical helps, etc.

Shakespeare Societies.

Record and Report of work in clubs and classes.

The Drama.

Dramatic notes and criticism.

Reviews.

Criticism by Specialists of books relating to Shakespeare and his contemporaries; to the Drama and histrionic art; and to the general study of English and of English Literature.

Literary Notes.

Announcement paragraphs on new books, and notices of Shakespearian articles in current magazines and newspapers.

Miscellany.

Items of Shakespearian interest collected from scattered points.

Supplements.

Selected reprints, with notes, of Shakespearian matter not commonly accessible.

Through these departments SHAKESPEARIANA aims to be of interest, not alone to the specialist in Shakespearian criticism, to teachers, and to Shakespeare clubs and classes, but to the actor and the dramatist, and to the student of general literature.

FOR SAMPLE COPY SEND 15 CENTS.

Leonard Scott Publication Co.,

1104 WALNUT STREET,

PHILADELPHIA.

BIBLICAL AND RELIGIOUS ALLUSIONS IN THE PLAY OF RICHARD II.

IF, in the play of *Richard II.*, Shakespeare had designed to define the limitations of the doctrine of the divine right of kings, he could hardly have been more explicit.

The powers that be are ordained of God—they are sovereigns by the grace of God, but justice and truth are the habitations of His throne, and king and peasant alike must obey the eternal laws of the King of kings. When they are trampled upon by anybody, the friendship, aid, and support of the great Ruler are forever forfeited.

The rise and progress of the sect of the Lollards had a great deal to do with the prevalence of these opinions. Their chief doctrine was personal accountability to God—their armor, Wicliffe's Bible. Neither church, priest, nor pope, could interpose between the soul and its God. With ever increasing numbers, until every third person you met was a Lollard, they fought against the corruptions of the church, and the wealth and luxury of the clergy. Among its devoted adherents were John of Gaunt and the Earl of Salisbury, while they enjoyed the toleration of Richard, and the patronage of his first queen—Anne of Bohemia.

In the midst of this religious ferment the play opens, and we have first a bitter quarrel, in which the astute and politic Bolingbroke plots indirectly against the king by accusing Norfolk, the true and faithful friend, of murder and treachery.

Notice his impressive appeal, his pious perjury cannot be surpassed in modern times, 'Heaven be the record to my speech, and for what I speak my body shall make good upon the earth, or my divine soul answer it in Heaven.' He seems to have no doubt that his 'divine

soul' shall have a first-class chance in that august tribunal. Norfolk retorts, 'God and all good men hate so foul a liar' (Scripture truth that), and goes on to declare his innocence, although he owns to attempting the life of the Lord of Lancaster. However, he says he confessed, and obtained absolution, and received the sacraments, and according to the easy conscience of the times thus squared all accounts 'twixt Heaven and earth.

Bolingbroke must have learned of the first murder which stained the fresh and innocent earth, for he speaks pathetically of the eloquent blood of Abel, and its striking likeness to the Duke of Gloster's ruddy streams.

In the interview between the Duchess of Gloster and Old Gaunt (I, ii), Old Gaunt refuses to espouse her cause, but lazily shuffles it off on the Almighty,—

> God's is the quarrel; for God's substitute,
> His deputy anointed in His sight,
> Hath caused his death: the which, if wrongfully,
> Let Heaven revenge,—

and then magnanimously commends her 'to God, the widow's champion and defence.' When the two combatants enter the lists for mortal combat (I, iii), their appeals to Heaven are as plentiful as those of a Lollard prayer-meeting. The Marshal says,—'In God's name and the King's, say who thou art.'

Norfolk replies:—

> My name is Thomas Mowbray . . . . . .
> Which God defend a knight should violate! . . .
> And by the grace of God and this mine arm,
> To prove him . . . . .
> A traitor to my God, my King, and me.

Bolingbroke says:—

> Harry of Hereford, Lancaster, and Derby
> Am I; who ready here do stand in arms,
> To prove by God's grace . . .
> That he's a traitor . . .
> To God of Heaven, King Richard, and to me.

Old Gaunt prays:—

> God in thy good cause make thee prosperous!

While the heralds declare they both stand there for their God and sovereign. When the King interferes in this delectable business of killing each other, their disappointment knows no bounds. Bolingbroke says, regretfully :—

> Norfolk, ...
> By this time had the King permitted us,
> One of our souls had wandered in the air,

thus showing his belief in the soul's separate existence. Norfolk refuses to confess a crime he has never committed, and exclaims with visions of the great judgment day rising before him—

> If ever I were traitor,
> My name be blotted from the book of life,
> And I from Heaven banished.

In the fourth scene of the first act, hearing of Old Gaunt's serious illness, King Richard offers an extraordinary, but evidently sincere prayer—

> Now put it God, in the physician's mind,
> To help him to his grave immediately!

evidently believing in the efficacy of second causes.

Notice again how, in the first scene of the second act, the dying Gaunt in that lofty description of his beloved England, speaks of her as renowned

> For Christian service and true chivalry,
> As is the sepulchre in stubborn Jewry,

and emphasizes his belief in the atonement when he refers to 'the world's ransom, blessed Mary's Son.'

When Bushy and Green, the King's sycophants, are told they must die (III, i), we hear no whining—

> My comfort is, that Heaven will take our souls,
> And plague injustice with the pains of hell:

a faith worthy of a better cause.

The handsome ease-loving King returns from Ireland to find a disaffected country and a tottering throne. Carlisle assures him (III, ii)

> That Power that made you king,
> Hath power to keep you king in spite of all.

Poor Richard finds himself in the woods, and whistles to keep up his courage. 'Who's afraid,' says he,—

> Not all the water in the rough, rude sea,
> Can wash the balm off from an anointed king,—

and then, with the vision of the twelve legions of angels which the Father has in reserve for the protection of his beloved Son, he adds:—

> God for his Richard has in heavenly pay
> A glorious angel: then, if angels fight,
> Weak man must fall; for Heaven still guards the right.

Every word shows his conviction of the unity of his cause with God's. When told of the treachery of some of his friends, he exhausts his vocabulary by calling them the 'three Judases.'

> Terrible hell make war
> Upon their clotted souls for this offence!

In the third scene of the third act, when he finds himself in the presence of Bolingbroke, Northumberland, and others, his waiting eyes are still unto Heaven—

> Yet know, my master, God omnipotent,
> Is mustering in His clouds, on our behalf,
> Armies of pestilence.—

evidently remembering the intervention of Jehovah in wrenching his chosen people from the grasp of Pharaoh.

In the first scene of the fourth act, when Bolingbroke speaks of his magnanimous resolve to recall Norfolk, Carlisle tells him it is too late; he briefly sketches the Christian soldier, whose pure soul has 'gone unto his Captain Christ, under whose colors he has fought so long.'

Bolingbroke replies with the most engaging resignation, 'Sweet peace conduct his sweet soul to the bosom of good old Abraham,' the reference undoubtedly being to our Lord's parable of Lazarus. The Bishop stands nobly by his King, calls him

> the figure of God's majesty,
> His captain, steward, deputy elect,
> Anointed, crowned, planted many years,

and prophesies dire disaster, and a new name for happy England—it is a Scriptural name, Golgotha, or the place of skulls. But all is of

no avail. Richard finds the divine right of kings a man of straw, his own unworthiness proves an impassable barrier to even the help of Heaven. In pathetic strains he laments his loneliness.—

> So Judas did to Christ: but he, in twelve,
> Found truth in all but one; I in twelve thousand none.

Further on he notes the strong resemblance of some of his friends to the old Governor of Judea—

> Though some of you, with Pilate, wash your hands,
> Showing an outward pity; yet you Pilates
> Have here delivered me to my sour cross,
> And water cannot wash away your sin.
>
> —IV, i, 239.

The venerable York, when describing the entry of the two cousins into London, shows his strong belief in an over-ruling Providence.

> Then had not God, for some strong purpose, steel'd
> The hearts of men, they must perforce have melted, . . .
> But Heaven hath a hand in these events.
>
> —V, ii, 34.

At last the pliable Richard is safely landed in a dungeon; he soliloquizes in a sweet and touching melancholy over his hard condition; speaks of the difficulty of thoughts of things divine; and says:—

> It is as hard to come, as for a camel
> To thread the postern of a small needle's eye.
>
> —V, v, 16.

His meditations are rudely broken, he has to fight for his life; slaying two in self-defence, he falls by the hand of a third, with the words—

> Mount, mount, my soul! thy seat is up on high;
> Whilst my gross flesh sinks downward, here to die;
>
> —V, v, 112.

In this play, which has been called the first and most admirable of the historical plays, one cannot but perceive how thoroughly it is saturated with the religious spirit and opinions of the time. The people were evidently beginning to think for themselves. We have not far to go for the reason of this profound change.

The word of God had been given to the people in their native tongue. One writer says that, in every town and hamlet in England, bibles

were to be seen chained to lecterns in public places. The people read with wonder and delight the pastoral poems of the Pentateuch, the songs of David, the visions of the prophets, and the stories of the New Testament. Whether they were interested in theology or not, it permeated their speech, and influenced their lives. This is especially noticeable in *Richard II.* But, after all, our Shakespeare remains first and last a poet. The spirit of propheey never possesses him. Already the dawn of the glorious Reformation was beginning to flush the eastern horizon, but having eyes he saw not; already a few sweet notes were ringing out on the expectant air, which ere long would swell from a thousand throats the great chorus of liberty, but having ears he heard not. As has been truly said, 'Man and man's nature remains to the last the one inexhaustible subject of Shakespeare.'

ANNA E. HENION.

THE GUNTHER FOLIO AND AUTOGRAPH.

175 DEARBORN ST., CHICAGO, December 6th, 1886.

C. F. GUNTHER, ESQ.,

DEAR SIR:—

AT the request of the Shakespeare Society of New York, I some time ago endeavored to investigate the early history of the copy of the second folio edition of Shakespeare's works (1632) now owned by you, which copy has an inscription upon one of the fly-leaves, signed 'John Ward' and pasted to which leaf there is a strip of paper bearing the name 'William Shakspeare.'

It seems to me proper that the results of such investigation should be communicated to you, and I, therefore, take this method of doing so.

Attached to the book is a letter dated 'Bath, Feb. 16, 1839,' signed

'Charles Godwin,' and addressed to 'Dr. Charles Severn,' in which the writer refers to 'the autographs of Ward and Shakespeare,' and, mentioning a volume which was sent with the letter, says: 'You will perhaps be of opinion that the volume once belonged to the John Ward whose books and records you have.'

In 1839 there was published in London a book entitled *The Diary of Rev. John Ward, A.M., Vicar of Stratford-upon-Avon—extending from 1648 to 1679—arranged by Charles Severn, M.D.*

On page 33 of this work occurs the following passage: 'In a copy of the folio edition of his (Shakespeare's) works, formerly in the possession of the Rev. J. Ward, "W. Shakspeare" is written on a slip pasted in, probably a genuine autograph obtained by Mr. Ward.' It, therefore, appeared that, if the letter addressed to 'Dr. Charles Severn,' signed 'Charles Godwin' and attached to your volume was a genuine document, you unquestionably had in your possession the identical volume referred to by Dr. Severn in his publication, and that the slip attached to your book, and bearing the name 'William Shakspeare,' was the one which Dr. Severn thought to be 'probably a genuine autograph' of Shakespeare's. Mr. Godwin's letter requests that the volume be returned to him through Messrs. Hamilton, Adams & Co., 33 Paternoster Row, London. That firm is still engaged in business at the same place, and an inquiry addressed to them as to Mr. Godwin, elicited the reply:—

He has been dead many years. Our old ledgers show him to have been a highly respectable bookseller at Bath, who bought largely from us, and for whom we acted as agent. After ten years we destroy old orders, but if you like to send us a tracing of the letter, we will put it before a gentleman who was well acquainted with Mr. Godwin's handwriting, and who describes it as a neat, small hand, generally written with a thick pen. Mr. Godwin's son became Librarian to the Marquis of Bute, and he may possibly hold that position now.

A photograph of Mr. Godwin's letter was then sent to Messrs. Hamilton, Adams & Co., who forwarded it to Mr. John Stark of 12 Busby Place, Camden Road, N. W., London, who returned it with the following comment:—

In returning you the 'photo,' I've no hesitation whatever in recognizing the handwriting to be that of the late Charles Godwin of

Bath, and the fact of my seeing so much of his correspondence with your firm, spreading over years, will entitle me to be an authority.

Inquiries made in Bath, through the kindness of Mr. Alfred Allen, editor of *The Journal of Microscopy and Natural Science*, also developed the facts that Mr. Charles Godwin had been a bookseller in Milsom street, Bath, and a man of literary repute; that on retiring from business he went to Barnstaple, a small seaport town in Devonshire, and afterwards came to live in Norfolk Crescent, Bath; and that his son was still the Librarian of the Marquis of Bute.

The evidence, therefore, seems to be conclusive that the letter attached to your book was written by a reputable and well-known bookseller to Dr. Severn, and that the book accompanying it was the one referred to by the latter in his edition of the *Rev. John Ward's Diary.*

It now seemed desirable to learn, if possible, whether Dr. Severn was correct in his supposition that the attestation in the volume signed 'Jno. Ward,' was in the handwriting of the Vicar of Stratford-upon-Avon of that name.

By the courtesy of Mr. Richard Savage, Librarian of Shakespeare's Birth-place at Stratford-upon-Avon, we were furnished with a careful tracing of a specimen of the Vicar's handwriting, including his signature. This demonstrated the fact that the memorandum in your book was not in his handwriting.

My attention was, however, called to the fact that in the year 1748 the Stratford bust of Shakespeare was carefully repaired, and the original coloring as far as possible preserved or restored, at the expense of Mr. John Ward, the grandfather of Mrs. Siddons. His theatrical company performed *Othello* at the Old Town Hall, Stratford, in September, 1746, and the proceeds of the entertainment he gave for the above object.

It seemed not impossible that he might have been the John Ward who once owned your book. Upon application to Mr. J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps, it appeared that in his matchless collection he had the original correspondence between this Mr. John Ward and the authorities of Stratford-upon-Avon as to the entertainment above mentioned.

We sent him a photograph of the memorandum contained in your book, and he sent us a tracing of some of the writing of this John Ward, the eighteenth-century actor, and not only Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps but all who have seen and compared the two specimens are unanimous in the conclusion that the handwriting is unquestionably the same. It certainly cannot be reasonably imagined that a copy of the second folio was 'cooked,' to correspond with the one described by Dr. Severn in his preface, for fraudulent purposes. For, even if a motive could have existed anywhere for such a proceeding, the fact that Dr. Severn himself was deceived by imagining the signature of John Ward, the actor, to be that of John Ward, the vicar, would instantly have exposed the fraud.

Your book contains a number of annotations signed 'C. L.' in some cases, and with the name 'Charles Lomax,' in full, in others. One of these is dated 1781, showing that the book was at that time in his possession.

Through the son of the late Mr. Charles Godwin, we learned that, although he was but nine years of age at the date of his father's letter, 1839, he remembered having heard the book frequently mentioned, and at that time it belonged to the Rev. Iltid Thomas of 5 Camden Place, Bath, and that Mr. Thomas and Mr. Godwin made many inquiries as to the autograph pasted in the book ; and that it was finally sent to London and sold for a small sum of money.

It was found that the Rev. Iltid Thomas left several children, among them a son named *Charles Lomax Thomas*, who was a clergyman, who held a living at or near Bradford in Yorkshire, and who died there some years ago.

Another son was found who stated that 'Charles Lomax' was the name of his maternal grandfather. It would, therefore, appear that the book was in the possession of a member of the family in 1781, and was still in the possession of the family in 1839, and that the possessors then knew nothing as to how the slip bearing the name of 'William Shakspeare' became pasted in the book.

These facts would seem to remove all possibility that the signature can have been one of the Ireland forgeries, as it does not seem prob-

able that such a book would pass from Mrs. Thomas' family to Mr. Ireland's possession and then back again to the family formerly owning it, while there was no recollection of such a fact by any of the members of the family and when the fact, if it had occurred at all, must have occurred but a few years before. Moreover, the signature has none of the peculiarities of the Ireland forgeries, and I believe that few would think of classing it with them.

In this statement, I have endeavored to avoid everything that could well be the subject of controversy or difference of opinion. The facts that have been proved in regard to your book, beyond all controversy, show that some time during the last century it was the property of a well-known actor, named John Ward, who was one of the first to take any interest in the personal relics of Shakespeare; that in 1781 it belonged to a certain Charles Lomax, and that in 1839 it had descended by the death of a former owner to the Rev. Iltid Thomas, of Bath, whose wife's father was named Charles Lomax. That the Rev. Mr. Thomas consulted Mr. Charles Godwin, a well-known bookseller of Bath, as to the book, and that the latter sent it for examination to Dr. Charles Severn, who was preparing the diary of the Rev. John Ward, once Vicar of Stratford-upon-Avon for publication.

Dr. Severn arrived at the erroneous conclusion that the inscription in the book had been made by the Vicar, and so stated in his publication. There seems every reason to believe that the slip was pasted in the book prior to the beginning of this century, and the probability is very strong that it was John Ward, the actor, who placed it there.

Two theories may be entertained as to the signature:

One, that John Ward, who evidently took a great interest not only in Shakespeare, but in his personal relics, may have obtained some letter or legal document bearing Shakespeare's signature, and cut the autograph off and pasted it in his copy of Shakespeare's works for preservation. This theory is strengthened by the fact that he is almost the first man who visited Stratford-upon-Avon with such a

strong personal interest in Shakespeare's personality as to be likely to make a diligent search for such a relic, and by the further fact that from Mr. Godwin's letter it appears that a *seal* formerly accompanied the book, and was supposed to be connected with the signature. So much might be urged in favor of this view, that—however easy it may be to doubt—it will appear upon investigation that there are as many difficulties in doubting as in believing it.

The other theory is that John Ward, having failed to find a genuine signature of the poet, took some opportunity to copy the last signature of the poet's will, and pasted this in his book as some little memento, even if a poor one, of the great dramatist. This would, of course, be done only for his own satisfaction, and without any thought of deceiving any one else in regard to it. Nothing but a careful comparison, by experts, of the signature in your book with that appended to Shakespeare's will, can definitely settle the question as to which of these two theories is true. I cannot pretend to be an expert in a comparison of signatures, and do not wish to express any opinion on the subject, as most of those who may examine the book will probably be at least as competent as myself to come to a correct conclusion on the subject.

Leaving this question in abeyance for the present, I believe that it is fully proved :

I. That the copy of the Second Folio now in your possession, is the one referred to by Dr. Severn in his Preface to his Edition of Ward's Diary, published in London in 1839;

II. That there is no presumption—and no claim possible—that a fraud or forgery has ever been attempted on the part of anybody in connection with your copy of the Second Folio;

III. That the slip pasted on the fly leaf of your copy of the Second Folio was so pasted there prior to the beginning of the present century.

Yours very truly,

E. P. Vining.

I concur in the statements made in the within letter, and in each and all of Mr. Vining's three conclusions therein arrived at.

New York, Dec. 10, 1886. Appleton Morgan.

RECENT SHAKESPEARE-BACON LITERATURE.

III.

323 RECENT SHAKESPEARE-BACON LITERATURE. By W. H. WYMAN. In *Shakespeariana*, Philadelphia, for March, April, and July, 1886. In all, 24 pages. *Unc.*

The three articles above form a continuation of the *Bacon-Shakespeare Bibliography*, and include Titles 256 to 322, all that were published in *Shakespeariana* in 1886. They are titled here for purposes of reference.

324 SHAKESPEARE'S SONNETS. *Chapter* VII of E. A. HITCHCOCK'S *Remarks on the Sonnets of Shakespeare*. 8vo. New York, 1865. *Unc.*

This title belongs, chronologically, to the original Bibliography, but was not discovered in time for insertion in it.

General Hitchcock refers to this question only on pages 87 to 89. We quote:

'The author of these *Remarks* had the pleasure of being well acquainted with the late talented and most unfortunate Miss Bacon, prior to the publication of her volume on the works of Shakespeare, and while her peculiar views were germinating in her mind. He had much conversation at the time with that accomplished lady, and heard with more curiosity, as he confesses, than interest, some of her opinions. He remembers particularly that *Midsummer Night's Dream* was one of the dramas selected by Miss Bacon for illustrating her theory, not indeed as to the authorship of the dramas, but as to their interior signification. He has, however, no distinct recollection of her interpretation of the plays, nor has he read her volume on the subject subsequently published. The writer remembers that she attributed the plays to Lord Bacon, and was of the opinion that the dramas, or some of them, were designed to express certain philosophic opinions in esoteric form, that form being selected because the age would not tolerate an open publication of them. In this connection it is proper to refer to the 66th Sonnet, which contains an enumeration of the many evils of the time, among which one was that Art was tongue-tied by authority; which may be thought some confirmation of Miss Bacon's views.'

325 NOTES AND QUERIES. London.

a—Review of Mrs. Pott's *Promus*, 6th Series, Vol. VII, pp. 359–60, May 5, 1883.

b—Review of Wyman's *Bibliography*, 6th S. X, 19, July 5, 1884.

c—Review of Mrs. Dall's *What We Really Know About Shakespeare*, 7th S. I, pp. 99–100, January 30, 1886.

d—Query. *Did Francis Bacon Write Shakespeare?* From Alfred Gatty, D. D. 7th S. I, p. 289, April 10, 1886.

e—Four answers to the above, by A. Hall, M. H. A. V., Este, and E. E. B. 7th S. I, pp. 397–8, May 15, 1886. *Unc.*

The remarks on the *Promus* and *Bibliography* are decidedly unfavorable, and each is sharply criticized. Mrs. Dall's book is more favorably mentioned.

This completes the record of all mention in *Notes and Queries* up to the present time

326 Who Was the Author of Shakespeare's Plays? By Franz Ludwig Lehmann. In the *Argus*, Bath, England, January 9, 1886. 2 columns. *Pro-Sh.*

Herr Lehmann, treating the Sonnets as autobiographical, instances Sonnet XXIX as one that, with its complaint against fate, could not have been written by Bacon.

327 Bacon versus Shakespeare. By R. M. Theobald. In the *Era*, London, March 7, 1886. Answered by J. G. Waller, in same paper, March 28, 1886. 1 column each. *Unc.*

Mr. Theobald instances 'the mass of facts accumulated' in support of the Baconian theory, and regards it as proven. One point that Mr. Waller makes is this: 'Bacon was a scholar in the usual acceptation of the term. In that sense, Shakespeare was not.' In evidence of it, he calls attention (from Farmer's book) to the fact that Shakespeare follows literally the errors in the translations, such as 'Lydia' for 'Libya,' and 'this side Tiber,' for 'beyond the Tiber,' errors which it was utterly impossible that Bacon could have adopted.

328 The Bacon Cipher. An account of a lecture by Hon. Ignatius Donnelly, before the Hermean and Delta Sigma Literary Societies of the University of Minnesota. In the *Tribune*, Minneapolis, Minn. June 1, 1886. *Anti-Sh.*

Mr. Donnelly says:

'Francis Bacon said it was wrong to speak of the ancient ages as the old ages of the world. They were the childish ages. To-day is the old age. We are justified in attacking former beliefs by the fact that all human progress is based on exploded human error. Every advance has had to face the prejudices of the day.'

In this lecture, Mr. Donnelly did not confine himself to the cipher, but gives a general résumé of the arguments in favor of Bacon.

Note.—Mr. Rolfe has a two-column article, *News from Donnelly*, in the *Literary World* of June 20, 1886.

In the Terre Haute, Ind., *Daily Express* of August 29, 1886, is an article on *The Donnelly Cipher* by Mr. Horace B. Jones. It gives a summary of Mr. Donnelly's claims, with a short account of the drama and stage in the days of Shakespeare. The writer seems to favor the cipher theory.

329 Mr. Donnelly and his Wonderful Cipher. By W. H. W. [W. H. Wyman.] In the *Commercial Gazette*, Cincinnati, June 4, 1886. 1½ columns. *Pro-Sh.*

This communication is written from the supposed standpoint of a printer and proof-reader. The writer gives a statement of the errors in pagination of the First Folio (which is made the basis of the cipher), and claims that, self-evidently, they are ordinary blunders of the printer, such as were very common in the books of that day.

Further, that the irregular use of capitals, brackets, hyphens and italics were a part, only, of the utter carelessness shown in every page of this abominably-printed book, and that for their use, or misuse, 'there seems to have been no known rule, except in the will of the compositor, or the want or surplusage of material.'

The main point of the article, however, is that a cipher such as Mr. Donnelly outlines was a mechanical, or typographical impossibility—that it was equally so, whether, as Mr. D. suggests, the cipher was first inserted in the manuscript to be reproduced in type, or whether it was inserted in the printed and numbered page from the proof. The latter the writer regards as by far the least impracticable of the two, but either one is hedged in by so many typographical difficulties, in view of its elaboration and its mathematically exact requirements, that no practical printer would believe in its possibility.

330 WHO WROTE THE PLAYS ASCRIBED TO SHAKESPEARE? The substance of Lectures on the Bacon-Shakespeare Controversy, by CHAS. H. HIGGINS, M.D. Liverpool: Henry Young, 12 South Castle street, 1886. Pamphlet, 8vo. pp. 54. *Pro-Sh.*

These lectures were delivered by Dr. Higgins before the literary societies of Birkenhead and Penrith. The first was devoted to showing the impossibility of Lord Bacon's connection with the plays; the second, to proving that they were the work of William Shakespeare. In the latter, amongst other reasons, the writer instances the contemporary evidence, the testimony offered by his early poems as to his ability, his familiarity with rural life in all its aspects, and the frequent use of Warwickshire names and phrases.

A full account of the lectures is found in the *Advertiser*, Penrith, England, Nov. 17 and 24, 1885.

331 WHO WROTE DICKENS? In *Macmillan's Magazine*, London, for June, 1886. 4 pp. *Pro-Sh.*

This is a travesty on the Baconian claim, the writer assuming the same line of argument and supposition to show that the novels of Dickens were written by Mr. Herbert Spencer. The illustrations and parallelisms are mainly from Pickwick.

In this connection, it may be mentioned that a recent number of the *Saturday Review*, February 5, 1887, contains an amusing poetical notice of a pamphlet *Wer Schrieb das Novum Organon*, by Herr Eugen Reichel, to prove 'that Bacon did not write the '*Novum Organum*,' but stole it from some Originalverfasser, and spoilt it in the stealing.' (Stuttgart: Bonz. London: Nutt.)

332 JOURNAL OF THE BACON SOCIETY. No. 1. Published periodically. London: June, 1886. 8vo. pp. 35. *Anti-Sh.*

This pamphlet opens with an account of the formation of the Bacon Society at No. 81, Cornwall Gardens, London, on 18th December, 1885. The objects of the Society are stated to be *first*, to study the works of Francis Bacon, his character, life, etc., and *second*, to investigate his supposed authorship of Shakespearian or other works unacknowledged by him. The officers are William Henry Smith, President; Mr. Alaric A. Watts, Vice-President; Mr. Henry Pott, Honorary Treasurer; Mr. Francis Fearon, Honorary Secretary; with a Committee of Management of seven members.

At a subsequent meeting, April 15, 1886, Dr. R. M. Theobald read a paper on *Bacon, as viewed by his Biographers*, highly eulogistic of Lord Bacon.

Mrs. Pott also read a paper on *Mr. Donnelly's Shakespeare Cipher*. In this, the writer gives a very complete account of Mr. Donnelly's claims, but takes care not to commit the Society to them in advance. A short extract:

'We await Mr. Donnelly's disclosures with eager interest, but we are not yet in a position to endorse them. The topic is ours; and if Mr. Donnelly makes good his professions, we shall share in his triumph, and accept him as our most distinguished ally. But Mr. Donnelly's chickens are not yet hatched, and we must decline the responsibility of tabulating the statistics of his poultry-farm before the process of incubation is completed. * * * * * * * We are apparently on the eve of a great literary discovery, and although the Baconian authorship of Shakespeare does not

depend upon any one proof, however forcible, yet nothing so conclusive has yet appeared, and we know very well that as soon as the cipher disclosure is complete, all other Baconian researches will take a new place in the public estimation.'

333 BURTON-SHAKESPEARE. A NEW GUESS. By G. W. S. [GEO. W. SMALLEY.] In the *Tribune*, New York, June 20, 1886. 1 column. *Pro-Sh.*

In Mr. Smalley's London letter, he calls attention to a new aspirant for Shakespearian honors. This is founded upon the following advertisement, which appeared in several numbers of the London *Times*. We take it from the issue of June 4, 1886.

> NOTICE.—Burton — Shakspere. — ROBERT BURTON, having been in all probability the author of the writings known as Shakspere's, all BOOKS, &c., used by him will have a peculiar value, and should be carefully PRESERVED.—Multum in Parvo.

Just one year before this, on June 2, 1885, a communication appeared in the *Tribune*, Denver, Colorado, *Who Wrote Shakespeare?* (See title 309.) It was signed, as the advertisement is, 'Multum in Parvo,' and advocated the claims of Robert Burton. Probably they were from the same source.

334 SHAKESPEARE, BACON, MOSES, AND THE CIRCULATION OF THE BLOOD. In the *Commercial Gazette*, Cincinnati, July 11, 1886. 2 columns. EVOLUTIONS OF SHAKESPEARE—GROWTH OF THE PLAY OF HAMLET. In same paper, August 28, 1886, 3 columns. By S. R. R. [S. R. REED.] *Pro-Sh.*

The first of these papers was brought out by a letter of Mr. Duff G. Reed, of Washington, printed in the New York *Sun* of July 4, 1886. This letter and the answer to it discuss the question as to whether the author of the plays knew of the circulation of the blood, previous to its announcement by Harvey, and as to its bearing on the question of the authorship.

The paper on the *Growth of Hamlet* is an elaboration of the difference between the *Hamlets* of 1603 and 1604—a difference unexplained by any theory as to the authorship, but giving some color to the statement that Shakespeare, the theatre-proprietor, 'kept a poet.'

'Self-evidently, the play that was printed in 1603 had come under the hand of a man of great poetical genius as printed in 1604—a genius not so much for ideas as for the euphonious selection of words, and for their musically flowing arrangement, and for taking an idea crudely expressed and transforming it into a grander and more artificial expression and a more poetic form.'

335 THE MYSTERY OF SHAKESPEARE REVEALED. SIR FRANCIS BACON THE REAL AUTHOR. By WILLIAM HENRY CHURCHER. Detroit, 1886. 8vo. pp. 110. *Anti-Sh.*

The writer announces in his Introduction that he has two objects in view: *first*, to discover the truth in regard to Shakespeare's authorship; and *second*, to assist in removing the blot upon the fame of Bacon. He derives his information entirely from the plays and the works of Bacon, having had no opportunity to read any of the works on the disputed authorship. His ideas are therefore original, and such as have not hitherto been met with in these discussions. One of these is that the dash, or line over a letter, which was used in the First Folio to denote the omission of the letter which should follow it, was placed there by Bacon to conceal a hidden meaning.

'The self-conceit of the author is equalled only by his ignorance, which is something stupendous.' Mr. ROLFE, *Literary World*, Nov. 11, 1886.

336 THE SAGE OF NININGER. A VISIT TO IGNATIUS DONNELLY. In the *Tribune*, Chicago, September 13, 1886. 4 columns. Also THE MINNESOTA AUTHOR CLAIMS THE CONTROVERSY IS SETTLED. In same paper, Sept. 25, 1886. 1½ columns. *Anti-Sh.*

The first is an interview with Mr. Donnelly in his country home. The explanation of the cipher is much the same as given in former articles. After explaining that his work was practically completed, only needing retouching here and there, a preface and a title-page, Mr. Donnelly 'then drew from their hiding-place four large bundles of cleanly written manuscript, neatly bandaged off into chapters. The writing is bold and clear—excellent copy for the printer. There are few erasures. Mr. Donnelly at once began to describe the form of his book. It will consist, he said, of four parts. The first part is intended to prove that Shakespeare could not possibly have written the plays; the second part to prove that Bacon did write them; the third part will consist of parallel passages from the plays and the works of Bacon, which will indicate identity of thought, style, composition, feeling, knowledge, purpose, and of language to express the same ideas; the fourth part contains a full elucidation of the cipher which, he says, will prove conclusively that Bacon claims, in the plays themselves, their authorship.'

In the article of Sept. 25, there is contained a memorandum (furnished the *Tribune* by Mr. Donnelly) of proof of the existence of a *Cipher* in the second part of *Henry IV*, showing how he arrived at the words 'found out.'

This memorandum is reproduced in SHAKESPEARIANA for February, 1887, pp. 94-5. A short article by Mr. JOHN BANFIELD doubting the correctness of the computation can be found in the same number, pp. 69-71.

337 HISTORY OF THE SHAKESPEARE-BACON CONTROVERSY. By E. A. CALKINS. In the *Times*, Chicago, Dec. 25, 1886. 2 columns. *Pro-Sh.*

Col. Calkins gives a short and succinct history of the controversy from its inception to the present time. In summing it up he characterizes it as 'A Discussion for Lawyers,' and calls attention to the fact that nearly all the eminent men who have adopted the Baconian theory are lawyers, and that a vigorous *esprit de corps* has much to do with it. We give the closing paragraph:

'Intellectual pride has also much to do with this phenomenon. A good lawyer instinctively loves a bad cause for the sake of making the best of it. Many of the greatest lawyers that ever lived have lost cases of the greatest magnitude through their ambition to pile up a splendid fabric of logic and argument in preference to building a more humble but more secure structure of plain law based on low but solid facts. E. G. Ryan and Matt. H. Carpenter both possessed this singular weakness and obliquity of mind. It was to them, as to many other distinguished advocates, a fascinating object to

> Make the worse appear
> The better reason, to perplex and dash
> Maturest counsels.'

To the names of Messrs. Ryan and Carpenter, the author might have added that of Hon. Geo. B. Smith—all residents of Wisconsin in contemporary practice, and all decided Baconians.

338 DELIA BACON'S CRAZE. THE FACTS IN THE CASE. Anonymous. [By G. O. SEILHAMER.] In the *Times*, Philadelphia, December 26, 1886. 4 columns. *Pro-Sh.*

A lengthy article, with a general review of the controversy, but principally in regard to the episode in Miss Bacon's life described in Miss Catharine E. Beecher's

book, *Truth Stranger than Fiction.* The writer traces its effect in the devotion of Miss Bacon's subsequent life to the development of the Baconian theory. The author intimates that Col. Hart (title No. 1) may have got his inspiration from the conversations of Delia Bacon. The dates do not seem to bear out this opinion. Col. Hart's first publication was in 1848, Miss Bacon's in 1856; and it is claimed on the part of Col. Hart, as well as Miss Bacon, that these opinions were matured and expressed long before they were announced to the public.

339 Review of *The Pilgrimage to Parnassus, with two parts of The Return from Parnassus.* (By Rev. W. D. Macray, Oxford, Clarendon Press.) In the *Athenæum*, London, November 13, 1886. 5 columns. *Unc.*

While this does not refer directly to the authorship, it is titled here owing to its bearing on the question. The review, and the book itself, is very interesting in new examples of the contemporary mention and appreciation of Shakespeare.

The book consists of a trilogy of comedies performed in St. John's College, Cambridge, A.D. MDXCVII-MDCI. The third part, *The Return from Parnassus, or the Scourge of Simony*, is well known, having been originally printed in 1606. The two other parts are now in print for the first time, having been recently discovered amongst the Hearne MSS. in the Bodleian Library, where they have lain for more than a century.

The *Athenæum* says that the newly-discovered passages deal a death-blow to the ancient fiction that Shakespeare lacked all just appreciation in his own age, and further, that the praise is unlike that offered by any other Elizabethan or Jacobean in Shakespeare's lifetime. Several examples of this are given, the most marked being where *Ingenioso* attempts a parody on *Venus and Adonis* 'in Mr. Shakespeare's veyne' and draws this comment from *Gullio.*

'Noe more! I am one that can judge accordinge to the proverbe, *bovem ex unguibus.* Ey marry, Sir, these have some life in them! Let this duncified worlde esteeme of Spenser and Chaucer, I'le worshipp sweet Mr. Shakespeare and to honoure him will lay his Venus and Adonis under my pillowe, as we reade of one (I do not well remember his name, but I am sure he was a kinge) slept with Homer under his bed's heade.'

340 Journal of the Bacon Society. No. II. London: December, 1886. 8 vo. pp. 76. *Anti-Sh.*

This contains the records of a meeting of the Society, held in London on 2d July, 1886.

Mr. Francis Fearon read his paper, *Did Francis Bacon write Shakespeare?* With some slight alterations, it is the same as read by him before the Dulwich Eclectic Club, and heretofore noticed in this series as Title 301. The pamphlet concludes with an article by Mr. R. M. Theobald on Mr. O'Connor's *Hamlet's Note Book*, and the subjects to which it refers.

W. H. Wyman.

A School of Shakespeare.

For his bounty,
There was no winter in't; an autumn 'twas
That grew the more by reaping.
—*Antony & Cleopatra*, V, ii, 86.

HENRY IV.—PART I.

WAS Henry IV regarded by his contemporaries as having usurped the throne of England, and did he in fact usurp it? The question is of interest in itself, as bearing upon the growth of constitutional government in England, upon the public sentiment of England at that time—if we can with propriety speak of fourteenth century public sentiment—and upon Shakespeare's view, as representing the sentiment of his England.

Shakespeare, in *Richard II* (IV, i, 272), makes Northumberland rely upon the Parliament—he refers particularly to the Commons—to accept and ratify Richard's abdication. 'The Commons will not then be satisfied;' and the implication is that the choice of Parliament gives Henry his title. So in *2 Henry IV* (I, iii, 87), the Archbishop of York says: 'The commonwealth is sick of their own choice.' On the other hand, Hotspur and Worcester in *1 Henry IV* (I, iii; IV, iii; V, i), and the king himself in *2 Henry IV* (III, i; IV, v), seem to regard his title from the feudal point of view, as imperfect; and the king takes great comfort in the thought that Prince Hal will be the heir by hereditary succession. King Henry's life is portrayed as successful, though troubled and wearying, and successful, apparently, because he represents the integrity of the people's life. That would seem to be the standard by which Shakespeare estimates the divinity of a king's right to rule. John sins against this law of national life by delivering up his kingdom to the Pope's legate, and fails; Richard II squanders his kingdom's resources, and is cast out as unworthy;

Henry IV claims to act, and does act for the good of the commonwealth, and he is successful. The national well-being is then the highest of national principles, so far as government goes. Compare the lives of King Lear, Macbeth, Richard III.

As to constitutional government, the election of Henry by the representatives of the people, marks strongly the advance to power of the Commons (Hallam's *Middle Ages*, chap. VIII, iii), and seems to mark the recurrence in the national life of the English as opposed to the Norman influence. The Teutonic monarchy had always been elective in principle (Guizot, *History of Civilization*, Chap. IX, p. 201; Hallam, Chap. VIII, i, ii, iii). Edward I is generally regarded as the first *English* king of England after the conquest; the others are either Normans or Frenchmen. The re-Englishing of England, beginning in his youth with Simon de Montfort's parliament, goes on under his son Edward II—appearing in the merely formal but significant mention of the Commons in the act of Parliament deposing him—and becomes an accomplished fact during the national wars of Edward III. In accordance with that theory, the deposition of Richard and the election of Henry, would be the ancestral and natural way of asserting the nation's right to be ruled by its own choice. Due allowance being made, the theory of the Revolution of 1688 seems to apply well to the revolution of 1399 (see Hallam, Chap. VIII, iii; Green's *Short History*, Chap. V, v, 277–78).

As to the public sentiment which sustained the election of Henry IV, it does seem that among the people of England, not merely the nobles and the ecclesiastics, but among all classes there was a feeling of dissatisfaction which vented itself upon the general worthlessness of Richard, and welcomed his formidable supplanter. To discuss the sources of this feeling of dissatisfaction and unrest would be to discuss the fourteenth century—too large a subject. The reader is referred to the topics suggested in SHAKESPEARIANA for March, 1887, under the play of *Richard II*, and to the various authorities there cited. In addition thereto, the conclusions of Guizot (Chap. VIII) as to the effects upon Europe of the crusades should be reconsidered. They not only revealed Europe to itself, he tells us, but they revealed the

separate nations of Europe severally to themselves, and then, and therefore, they ceased, so soon as that was thoroughly accomplished.

The principal effect of the crusades was a great step towards the emancipation of the mind, a great progress towards enlarged and liberal ideas. Though begun under the name and influence of religious belief, the crusades deprived religious ideas, I shall not say of their legitimate share of influence, but of their exclusive and despotic possession of the human mind.—Guizot *Hist. Civ.* p. 182.

Europe, having graduated in that school of experience, began to investigate and apply the ideas therein acquired. During the twelfth century new universities were founded, those in existence were enlarged, and, mainly under the impulse of the contact by the crusaders with the Greeks and the Arabs: in these universities men were studying, in the fourteenth century, medicine, mathematics, Aristotelian metaphysics, astrology and astronomy, alchemy, civil law, theology. Men were busy ransacking and adapting the great storehouse of Latin literature; they were beginning to study Greek (Hallam, Chap. IX). It was an age of the diffusion of ideas; but ideas traveled slowly, like the men who pondered them. (Only fifty years ago it took Macaulay four months to sail to India.) The great genius of Dante, flaring like an enormous beacon-light out of the abysmal depths of his 'Hell' with an intensity never since surpassed, must have influenced and stimulated the daring thought of his century as powerfully as he has that of succeeding times. In the dread torments of Hell all men are equal so far as earthly rank goes, Dante gives us to understand; the only inequality is native ability and opportunity to choose and to do good or evil; a pope may lie howling far below a peasant; the man and not the rank is what Minos looks at. If so in Hell, why not so on earth? Here is one of Chaucer's speculations, instigated, it is believed, by Dante. He is in the talons of the mighty eagle, soaring up far above the earth on the way to the House of Fame. The eagle says:—

> Sound is naught but air broken,
> And every speech that is spoken,
> In his substance is but air.
> Throw on water now a stone.
> Well know'st thou it will make anon

A little roundel like a circle. . . .
That circle will cause another wheel,
And that the third, and so forth, brother,
Every circle causing other,
Wider than himself was—
(Till) that it at both banks be. . .
And right thus every word, iwis,
That loud or privy-spoken is,
Moveth first an air about,
And of this moving, out of doubt,
Another air anon is moved,
As I have of the water proved,
That every circle causeth other.
Right so of air, my dear brother,
Every air other steereth
More and more and speech up-beareth,
Or voice, or noise, or word, or sound,
Ever through multiplication,
Till it be at the House of Fame!

A most philosophical fowl; and does he not set forth a crude form of the 'wave theory' of sound? (See the whole passage in the *House of Fame*, ll. 257–314, Gilman's *Chaucer*.) But it is not as the learned theorizer, but as the story-teller, as the portrayer of his age, as the poet, that we admire and delight in Chaucer. (See James Russell Lowell's beautiful Essay on Chaucer in *My Study Windows;* also, Taine's *English Literature*.) Like Dante he pierces through the rank or profession to the man beneath and holds him up for scorn or admiration, 'the man's the gowd for a' that.' His Monk, 'to ben an abbot able,' is self-indulgent, a voluptuary, a disgrace to his profession; his Friar is so plainly a knave that he hardly pretends, in the presence of knowing people, to conceal it; his country Parson, poor in the world's pelf, is 'riche of holy thought and werk,' 'Cristes lore he teaches, but first he follows it himself;' his noble Knight he admires not because of his rank, but because 'he lovede chyvalrye, trouthe and honour, fredom and curteisie;' he thinks, perhaps, as he writes, of the Black Prince and Sir John Chandos. Christ, he tells us elsewhere, is the true gentleman; those most like him, then, are most gentlemen. His Griselda, a sort of half-divine Joan of Arc of the moral world, has to work hard in the dirt, with scarcely a decent frock to her back;

but her pure and true woman's heart rises easily to the gracious bearing of the wife of the great Marquis Walter. She stands before him like one of Raphæl's Madonnas stepped out of the canvas. Is he worthy of her? no matter; she loves what is noble in him with a love that glorifies him. Did Christ stop to ask if men were worthy of his love? 'Love will conquer at the last.' And man is worthy in himself, and worthy of being loved; that is the conclusion of Chaucer.

This idea underlay Chivalry, but was dwarfed and deformed into a class-idea. What was true of the knight need not apply to the commoner, still less to the villain. Chaucer saw that it should apply to all. The commons and the villains of the time of Richard II were no longer what they had been a generation before. 'Through the reign of the three Edwards, two revolutions, which have been almost ignored by our historians, were silently changing the whole character of English society. The first of these, the rise of a new class of tenant-farmers, we shall have to notice hereafter in its connection with the great agrarian revolt which bears the name of Wat Tyler. The second, the rise of the craftsmen within our towns, and the struggle by which they won power and privilege from the older burghers, is the most remarkable event in the period of our national history at which we have arrived.' (Green, *Short History*, Chap. IV, v, 213.) The Merchants (see *Prologue*, *Canterbury Tales*, 270–284) and the Craftsmen (*Prologue*, 361–378) having wealth, influence, and intelligence, felt themselves, as well as the gentry, entitled to some of the rights of manhood; but they looked down upon the villains. But the villains in their turn had learned that their brothers and sons might, by going into the Church-schools, rise to very high places and sit by the side of, perhaps even above the knights; that they could drive their grey-goose shafts right through a knight's armor into his very heart, as they had done at Cressy; that the 'Black Death' had made them valuable to the kingdom as they never had been before; and they felt that they too were entitled to some of the rights of man—at least to be recognized as men. Why should the hind belong to his lord; why not to himself alone? By what right does anybody own anything? To such questions the masses of the people, commons and nobles, were feeling their way. The answer came naturally from the

Church which claimed to be the arbiter of all questions of moral right. But it was from the Church in revolt against itself, not from the time-serving, place-hunting Church that there went forth a voice destined to echo forever, it seems likely, in the hearts of Englishmen—and of Americans. John Wiclif answered from Oxford, in effect: 'Everything belongs to God alone;' all dominion is from God; the temporal dominion granted to the State is as sacred as the spiritual dominion granted to the Church, and neither subordinate to the other; he utterly denied the Pope's supremacy over the King. But going further he swept away the basis of a mediating priesthood. 'With the formal denial of the doctrine of transubstantiation, which Wiclif issued in the Spring of 1381, began that great movement of revolt which ended, more than a century after, in the establishment of religious freedom, by severing the mass of the Teutonic peoples from the general body of the Catholic Church.' He had before attacked the endowments of the clergy, as Dante had done (*Inferno* XIX, 115-120; see also Green's *Short History*, Chap. II, iii; Hallam, Chap. VIII, iii; *The English Works of Wiclif*, published by *Early English Text Society*). Wiclif's attack on the papacy found favor among the nobles; his assertion of the profound and noble radicalism of Christianity, bringing man directly into relation with God, was generally rejected by the upper classes. If his doctrines made their way directly among the peasantry, they found them ready for revolt and socialism. Their treatment had been cruelly harsh; their misery was great; so was their thirst for revenge; any doctrine that seemed to them to put men on a level, was like a signal to attack the higher classes—much as to the Paris mob 'Liberty, Equality,' meant the guillotine for the French nobility. They had already been listening to John Ball, the 'mad priest of Kent,' in whose preaching 'England first listened to the knell of feudalism and the declaration of the rights of man' (see Green, 'The Peasant Revolt'). The pure doctrines of Wiclif translated into popular action helped to produce a national convulsion which came on in terror and passed away in blood under Richard II, leaving Lollardry as a threat to the throne for years to come under Henry IV.

Let us look a little more closely at this peasantry and its condition. Some twenty odd years before Wat Tyler's revolt, a similar uprising

had taken place in France—the Jacquerie. Froissart describes its beginning thus:—

Some of the inhabitants of the country towns assembled together in Beauvoisis without any leader; they were not at first more than one hundred men. They said that the nobles of the kingdom of France, knights and squires, were a disgrace to it, and that it would be a very meritorious act to destroy them all; to which proposition every one assented, and added, shame befall him that should be the means of preventing the gentlemen from being wholly destroyed. . . . Among other infamous acts, they murdered a knight; and having fastened him to a spit, roasted him before the eyes of his wife and his children, and, after (nameless outrages) they forced her to eat some of her husband's flesh, and then knocked her brains out. They had chosen a king among them; . . . he was elected as the worst of the bad and they denominated him James Goodman (Jacques Bon-Homme). . . . They were by this time so much increased in numbers, that had they been all together they would have amounted to more than one hundred thousand.—Froissart, Book I, Chap. 181.

These are worthy forerunners of some of the 'citoyens' of the French Revolution (see Taine's *Ancient Regime*).

Froissart begins his account of Tyler's rebellion thus:—

There happened in England great commotions among the lower ranks of the people, by which England was near ruined without resource. Never was a country in such jeopardy as this was at that period, and all through the too great comfort of the commonalty. Rebellion was stirred up as it was formerly done in France by the Jacques Bons-Hommes, who did much evil and sore troubled the kingdom of France. It is marvellous from what a trifle this pestilence raged in England. In order that it may serve as an example to mankind, I will speak of all that was done from information I had at the time on the subject. It is customary in England, as well as in several other countries, for the nobility to have great privileges over the commonalty, whom they keep in bondage; that is to say, they are bound by law and custom to plough the lands of gentlemen, to harvest the grain, to carry it home to the barn, to thrash and winnow it; they are also bound to harvest the hay and carry it home (and to hew their wood and bring it home.—Lord Berners). All these services they are obliged to perform for their lords, and many more in England than in other countries. . . . The evil-disposed in these districts began to rise, saying they were too severely oppressed; that at the beginning of the world there were no slaves, and no one ought to be treated as such unless he had committed treason against his lord, as Lucifer had done against God: but they had done no such thing, for they were neither angels nor spirits, but were formed after the same likeness with their lords, who treated them as beasts. This they

would no longer bear, but had determined to be free, and if they labored or did any other work for their lords, they would be paid for it.—Froissart, Book II, Chap. 73.

Froissart's tone of ineffable superiority is most instructive. Rarely, as has been said, the peasant escaped from this grinding slavery through the Church and its schools. They educated the

Plowman's brother who was to be the parson, not often the plowman himself. Once, though, made a scholar and monk there, and sent by the Monastery to the University, the workman's, if not the plowman's, son, might rule nobles and sit by kings, nay, beard them to their face. . . There is one side of the picture, the workman's son turned monk, and clerk to a lord. Let us turn to the other side, the plowman's son who didn't turn monk, whose head *was* 'shet' in the straw, who delved and ditched, and dunged the earth, eat bread of corn and bran, worts fleshless (vegetables, but no meat), drank water, and went miserably (*Crede* l. 1565–71). What education did he get? To whom could he be apprenticed? What was his chance in life? Let the Statute-Book answer:

'*A. D.* 1388, 12° *Rich. II, Cap. V.*

Item. It is ordained and assented, That he or she which used to labour at the Plough and Cart, or other Labour or Service of Husbandry *till they be of the age of Twelve years, that from thenceforth they shall abide at the same Labour*, without being put to any Mystery or Handicraft; and if any Covenant or Bond of Apprentie (*so*) be from henceforth made to the Contrary, the same shall be holden for none.'

'*A. D.* 1405–6, 7° *Henri IV, Cap. XVII.*

. . And whereas in the Statutes made at Canterbury among other Articles it is contained That (see Statute above): Notwithstanding which Article . . . the Infants . . whose Fathers and Mothers have no Land nor Rent nor other living . . . to put . . . to serve and bound apprentices to divers Crafts within the Cities and Boroughs of the said Realm *sometime at the Age of Twelve years, sometime within the said Age*, and that for Pride of Clothing and other evil Customs that Servants do use in the same; so that there is great Scarcity of Labourers and other Servants of Husbandry *that the Gentlemen and other People of the Realm be greatly impoverished for the Cause aforesaid:* Our Sovereign Lord the King . . by the advice and assent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and at the request of the said Commons, hath ordained and stablished, That no Man or Woman, of what Estate orCondition they be, shall put their Son or Daughter of whatsoever Age he or she be, to serve as Apprentice to no Craft nor other Labour within any City or Borough in the Realm, except he have Land or Rent to the value of Twenty Shillings by the year at the least, but they shall be put to other labours as their Estates doth require, upon Pain of one year's imprisonment, and to make Fine and Ransom at the King's Will. . . Provided Always, that every Man and Woman, of what Estate or

Condition that he be, shall be free to set their Son or Daughter to take Learning at any manner School that pleaseth them within the Realm.'

A most gracious saving clause truly! for those children who were used to labour at the plough and cart till they were twelve years old. . . . The early practice of the Freemasons, and other crafts, refusing to let any member take a bondsman's son as an apprentice, was founded on the reasonable apprehension that his lord would or might afterwards claim the lad, make him disclose the trade-secrets, and carry on his art for the lord's benefit.—*Early English Meals and Manners. Forewords* (ed. Furnivall), pp. xliv–xlix; published by E. E. Text Society. See also *Statute of Laborers* in Green.

In the light of such fierce class-oppression, the words of Morton (*2 Henry IV:* I, i, 207–8)—'a bleeding land gasping for life under great Bolingbroke,' come to us with a new and painful force.

Mr. Furnivall continues:—

If rich men and masters were dirty, poor men and servants must have been dirtier still.

William Langland's description of Hawkyn's one metaphorical dress in which he slept o' nightes as well as worked by day, beslobbered (or by-*moled*, bemauled) by children, was true of the real smock; flesh-moths must have been plentiful, and the sketch of coveitise, as regards many men, hardly an exaggeration:

. . . as a bonde-man (by) his bacon his berd was bi-draveled,
With his hood on his heed, a lousy hat above,
And in a tawny tabard, of twelf wynter age
Al so torn and (filthy), and full of lys creeping,
But if that a lous (could), han (crept) the better,
She shode noght han walked on that (stuff) so was it thread-bare—(*Vision*, Passus V, ed. Wright).—*Early English Meals and Manners*. Pp. lxiv–lxv.

Can we wonder that men so clothed, half-starved, so oppressed, were ready for rebellion, or that they should murder brutally the Archbishop of Canterbury as the head of their priestly oppressors? The Church had already tried to establish a caste, and failed; under Richard II and Henry IV, the upper classes seemed to be trying to force the English peasantry into the conditions of caste-life, and they failed—failed owing largely to the spread of ideas caused by the establishment of the national speech and literature through and in the works of Chaucer, Wiclif, and Langland.

In addition to Guizot, Hallam, and Green, see for this period *Edward III*, and the *Houses of Lancaster and York* in *Epochs of Modern History* (Scribner); Warton's *History of English Poetry*.

Wm. Taylor Thom.

Shakespeare Societies.

Such a holy witch
That he enchants societies into him;
Half all men's hearts are his. —*Cymbeline*, I, vi, 166.

The Norwich Shakespeare Club.—In the winter of 1881, a little circle of some fifteen members gathered together at Norwich, Conn., for the purpose of studying the plays of Shakespeare. Most of us were members of a reading club whose studies did not extend beyond the elocutionary effect of the plays read. But in studying such effect in Shakespeare's plays, we naturally found new fields opening before us, and were thus led to band ourselves together in a very informal way, for the pursuit of these more 'desperate studies.'

It could not be called an organization, for there were no officers, no constitution, no by-laws. The plans for our course were simply discussed in an informal way, and adopted by common consent. We met fortnightly, each member having previously prepared a given topic or question in the play under consideration, while all were expected to be prepared to discuss all the topics or questions. There was no limit as to the age or sex of our members. We were contented to fast during our meetings, endeavoring, as we did, to find a sufficiency in a 'feast of reason,' although a few men, of somewhat Bohemian tendencies, would sometimes remain after the regular session was ended, when the meeting would be talked over amidst clouds of tobacco smoke and other improvised festivities. On the whole, it was an instructive and enjoyable circle—a nondescript in its way, for it could hardly be called either a class or a club. The results were naturally meagre. We made the mistake of thinking we could dispose of a single play in a session of about two hours; and rarely carried over a play to a second meeting. Still, an undefined sense of incompleteness often led to good results in the way of special study, outside of the circle.

We kept together with varying membership, missing one year entirely; and were encouraged to renewed efforts by the announcement that SHAKESPEARIANA would offer us suggestions as to study.

On the appearance of the October number, we met and read the general plan which was marked out and suggested for study and organization, and though, from force of habit, we did not organize in any more marked form than before, we determined to follow the SHAKESPEARIANA course as closely as possible.

Our first evening was wholly devoted to the questions on *Antonio*, in the November number, and though we had not specially prepared ourselves to answer these questions, still our familiarity with the play, under the advice in the October number, yielded good results, and the time was fully and profitably occupied in discussing these questions. It would have been well for us to follow the same course in the study of the other leading characters as a measure preparatory to the discussion of Prof. Thom's questions, but we concluded at our next meeting to take up those questions at once with only such preparatory study as the intervening fortnight would allow. As a natural result we simply took up selections from Prof. Thom's questions, which were discussed at our next meeting, leaving many of them for future reference. Finding that we needed closer study of the leading characters, questions on *Portia* were prepared on the plan suggested by the 'C. P.' questions on *Antonio*. This study of *Portia* involved also a study of *Bassanio*.

We next decided to take up the play as a whole, with a view to fixing in our memories the scenes and acts in order, their connection with each other, and their dramatic effects in these connections, involving, in each scene, the question of time, place and characters introduced, as well as the impressions which an adequate stage representation would leave on the mind at the close of each scene. For example, the questions in II, i, were:

Where is the scene laid? How much time has elapsed since the first scene? What new character appears? Do the impressions of the previous scene still indefinitely remain? Or definitely? The surroundings?

Such questions were really suggested by the course marked out in Prof. Thom's plan, and in the October number. Although we were all more or less familiar with *The Merchant of Venice* from study in former years, even those of us who were most familiar, found we had much to learn, and after five evenings devoted to the play, we leave it with the feeling that there is more to be done, and yet with a feeling of satisfaction at the results accomplished.

We now number seventeen members. Our way of working is for one member to read the questions, and usually ask an answer from some other member, leading, in most cases, to a general discussion, and sometimes to interesting arguments. We find no special difficulties in this way of working.

We do not, in any sense, look upon our circle as a model class, club or society, and it is, as has been said, strictly speaking, none of these. Yet we feel that in spite of the nondescript character of our gatherings, we are bound together by a common feeling of wholesome hero-worship, and that, with the aid of SHAKESPEARIANA'S plans, new revelations are continually opening before us, in the works of the world's greatest dramatist.

THE LOCKE RICHARDSON SHAKESPEARE CLUB of Oakland, Cal., has just completed the first year of its existence, and since its organization and conduct have been deemed worthy of notice in SHAKESPEARIANA, it may not be amiss to give a brief report of progress. During the year the Club has made a study of three plays:—*The Merchant of Venice, As You Like It,* and *The Tempest.* It now proposes to turn from the romantic drama to the historical in *King John,* intending therein to avail itself of the valuable assistance afforded in the School of Shakespeare. Its method of study, perhaps somewhat desultory and tentative at first, has of late crystalized quite definitely about these objects:—(1) a firm basis of knowledge of the play itself in all the features of its embodiment—historical, textual, and linguistic—as the only sure means (2) to a knowledge of its art, its purpose, and its power. To this end the play is read in short sections, a scene usually occupying the whole of one evening. The parts (assigned

previously by lot, and changed from session to session) are rendered oftentimes with great individuality and spirit. At convenient pauses in the scene the reading is interrupted for a general interchange of question and answer, comment, criticism, and suggestion, the discussion thus started, often widening in its scope till it touches the deeper questions of soul and of art. Another and most delightful feature has been the rendering of the stage songs as they occur in the play, in their quaint and antique settings. In this way, individual ability, whether scholarly, dramatic, or artistic, finds full scope for its exercise, and is invited to set the tone, which generous emulation may be trusted to take up and sustain. Furthermore, the abstract features of study and criticism are thus continually relieved by the livelier dramatic impersonation and interpretation. At the conclusion of this detailed study of *The Tempest*, the Club devoted three sessions to the purpose of gathering up and unifying the results of its work. On one of these occasions, with a view to the *tout-ensemble*, the play was rendered as a whole by a cast specially selected for the purpose. On another, there was a general 'quiz'—not an examination by any means, but a device for reinforcing and strengthening the individual hold upon all the points developed during the study of the play. On the third, and by way of final summing-up, two or three of the larger questions, artistic and spiritual, concerned with *The Tempest*, were presented in brief papers, and were afterwards discussed by the Club generally. The study of this last play began October 2d, and continued till February 10th, occupying ten regular sessions. In addition to this, during the period named, a concert illustrative of English ballad music, and Shakespearian songs, and a public lecture upon *The Tempest*, were given under the auspices of the Club.

The membership has been maintained very steadily at about thirty. The meetings are held fortnightly at the houses of various members. The most noticeable feature of them perhaps is their spontaneity, and the absence of anything resembling formality or constraint. There are no refreshments, no stated dues, almost no running expenses. The only fine is a dime for tardiness, but the Club occasionally taxes itself to the extent of twenty-five or fifty cents apiece for the purchase of

new books. In this way, to its original nucleus of a library—the Furness Variorum Tragedies, and other volumes, presented by Mr. Locke Richardson—it has been gradually adding the more essential portions of critical apparatus, the Concordances, Lexicons, Facsimiles, Grammars, and Manuals. Thus newly equipped, and with the stimulus of a more concentrated purpose, the Club looks forward to a term of yet greater efficiency and interest.

C. B. Bradley, President.

Oakland, Cal., Feb. 12, 1887.

The Shakespeare Society of Seneca Falls, was organized November 6, 1883, mainly through the influence of Mrs. Silsby, who was chosen President of the Society, and has continued in that office ever since. The Society numbers twenty-eight members, and by its rules cannot pass this limit. It has an executive committee of five, including a President, Vice-President, Secretary and Treasurer. The payment of a small annual fee is slowly adding to the fund in the Treasury, which is to be used in purchasing books for the Library. Meetings are held every Tuesday evening, from October 1st to May 1st.

The general method of proceeding is as follows: Two evenings are devoted to reading a play, and then two evenings, either to answering an exhaustive list of questions, or reading original essays upon topics connected with, or suggested by the play, the subjects and writers being chosen by the President. Thus four weeks of study are given to each play. Although for some of the plays such as *Lear* and *Hamlet*, more than twice that number of weeks have been given.

Opinions and criticisms are in order at every meeting, and often animated discussions arise, and then the time passes away only too quickly.

For text books, the Society uses principally Rolfe's edition of Shakespeare, and its interest has been increased and its study very much aided by his invaluable little books which this Society cordially recommend to all Shakespeare students.

The Drama.

Betwixt mine eye and heart a league is took,
And each doth good turns now unto the other.
—Sonnet XLVII.

VERDI AND OTELLO.—The month of November, 1885, I spent a few days in Genoa, and during that stay I had several times the opportunity to see the most popular man of modern Italy, Guiseppe Verdi, in his studio at the famous palace of the Dorias. In the choice of this residence one perceives his love for contrasts. On the one side the noise of trains, continually coming and going, on the other side the majestic bay, smiling in sunshine. The old *maestro* can look from his windows over the city of beautiful villas and palaces, and at the vessels entering the harbor. He can contemplate under the clear blue sky, or under the starry vault at night; and if a tempest raves over the sea, he can listen to the harmonies of nature, which will sing with his genius a song of mystery in his soul.

At 1.30 o'clock yesterday afternoon (the performance commencing a quarter past eight) I was among the crowd which waited before the entrance of the gallery of *La Scala*, the only unreserved place of the theatre. Every place was taken, only the royal box was empty. In the stalls I perceived many distinguished people, foreign and native representatives of music, art, and literature; Ernesto Rossi stood for the drama. The performance was an immense success; composer, poet (Signor Boito, who wrote the libretto), and the principal performer were called before the curtain again, and again; there was no end to the shouting—*Viva Verdi!*—and the waving of handkerchiefs, and enthusiastic applause.

The music of this illustrious old man is the companion of our generation. His music will follow us around the world, caressing our hearts and ears. Verdi does not know the laughing sounds of

Pergolese, or of Donizetti, but his music lives, it weeps in joy and pain, and its passionate cries will have an immortal echo.

Otello neither resembles the German nor the Italian music. *Otello* is not Wagner, *Otello* is not Verdi, the Verdi of *Il Trovatore*, and *Aida*. It is something entirely new! Verdi, at the age of seventy-three, when other men rest on their laurels, has written his masterpiece, though it may never be as popular as his first compositions.

Let me point out a few of the beauties of which *Otello* contains no small measure.

Act I. The beginning is rough, a most powerful music of the storm, with lightning, thunder, and the roaring of winds. The drinking song of Cassio is full of character, and had an enormous success. It is followed by the duel between Cassio and Montano. In the last scene Desdemona and Otello, in fierce embrace, sing tender words of love, while the accompaniment of violins and harps grows softer and softer, till the last sounds are melted into the trembling air.

Act II. The *credo* of Iago, persuading Cassio to demand the protection of Desdemona, is a piece of horrible beauty, well sung by Mr. Maurel, a French baritone. A chorus of charming suavity, sung by young peasant girls, offering flowers to Desdemona, sounds still in my ears. The most remarkable part in the second act is the great quartet which rivals even that of *Rigoletto*.

Act III. The *trio* of the handkerchief deserves the name of a dramatic composition; it is wonderful with what simplicity Verdi has known how to express the different feelings, and yet every rôle conserves its musical character. The end of this act is grand, in music as well as in stage effect. Otello overpowered by his passion and despair sinks down to the feet of triumphant Iago, while the people outside still cry, 'Viva, the lion of Venice!'

Act IV begins with a sad prelude played by the flutes. Desdemona sings her Ave Maria, which she (Mme. Pantaleoni) had to repeat several times. Otello appears for the last time, and in the following scene the tenor, Tamagno, proved himself a lyric tragedian. As he, dying, pressed his lips once more against the cold lips of his well-beloved one, while the orchestra played softly the melody of the love duet, no eye was dry, at least not mine. B. L.

Milan, 6th Feb.

Shakespeare in Pantomime.—At the Theatre Royal, Birmingham (England), a remarkably pretty display of Shakespearian characters and tableaux was introduced into the pantomime now performing there. The representation was the old nursery tale of *Cinderella*, and in the ball-room scene, where the Prince dances with Cinderella in her glass slippers, the tableaux take place. The scene was perhaps as unique and effective as was ever produced upon the stage, and the Shakespearian characters were mostly personated by children and young persons. After a dance, when sixty or seventy of the dancers are ranged around the stage, a diminutive Queen Elizabeth enters with a flourish of trumpets, and escorted by heralds and pages, takes her seat upon the throne. Then comes William Shakespeare in the well-known costume of trunk hose and short cloak, represented by a youth of about twelve or thirteen, holding a scroll in one hand, and a pen in the other. He makes his obeisance to the Queen, and stands aside. Then come in the characters enumerated in the twenty-seven following plays. Each set is preceded by a herald carrying a banner, on which is inscribed the name of the play from which the characters are taken, and each is accompanied by an appropriate selection of music. Thus, for *Twelfth Night* is played the well-known air 'Where the bee sucks,' and *King John* is introduced by 'Rule Britannia,' typifying that 'Britons never will be slaves.' The characters represented come in at the back of the stage, and advancing to the front, go through the pantomimic action supposed to exemplify the quotations given. They then retire and take their places at the sides of the stage, then the succeeding group follows in similar manner. After the introductory tableau of

Shakespeare, Queen Elizabeth, Lords, Ladies and Attendants,

the plays are represented in the following order:—

1. *Hamlet:* (Hamlet, the Ghost).
   Hamlet. I say away. Go on. I'll follow thee. —I, iv.
2. *Romeo and Juliet:* (Romeo, Juliet, Friar Laurence).
   Friar Laurence. You shall not stay alone
   Till holy church incorporate two in one. —II, vi.
3. *King Lear:* (King Lear, Cordelia, The Fool).

King Lear. Let it be so, thy truth, then, be thy dower. —I, i.

4. *Julius Cæsar:* (Julius Cæsar, Brutus).
Julius Cæsar. Et tu Brute? Then fall, Cæsar. —III, i.

5. *Antony and Cleopatra:* (Antony, Cleopatra, Attendants).
Cleopatra. If it be love indeed, tell me how much? —I, i.

6. *The Merry Wives of Windsor:* (Sir John Falstaff, Mrs. Ford, Mrs. Page).
Falstaff. I am here a Windsor stag. —V, v.

7. *Much Ado about Nothing:* (Benedick, Beatrice).
Benedick. Tarry, good Beatrice—By this hand I love thee.
Beatrice. Use it for my love some other way, than swearing by it. —IV, i.

8. *Twelfth Night:* (Orsino, Sebastian, Viola, Olivia, Malvolio).
Malvolio. I have limed her; but it is Jove's doing,
And Jove make me thankful. —III, iv.
Orsino. But when in other habits you are seen,
Orsino's mistress and his fancy's queen. —V, i.

9. *Taming of the Shrew:* (Katherine, Petruchio, Grumio, Tailor).
Petruchio. Why this was moulded on a porringer,
What is this? mutton? * * 'Tis burnt. —IV, i.

10. *Two Gentlemen of Verona:* (Proteus, Valentine, Launce and his Dog).
Proteus. All happiness bechance to thee in Milan! —I, i.
Launce. Oh, 'tis a foul thing when a cur cannot
Keep himself in all companies. —IV, iv.

11. *Merchant of Venice:* (Bassanio, Antonio, Portia, Shylock).
Portia. This bond doth give thee here no jot of blood. —IV, i.

12. *Midsummer Night's Dream:* (Bottom, Titania, Oberon and Fairies).
Titania. What, wilt thou hear some music, my sweet love?—IV, i.

13. *As You Like It:* (Rosalind, Orlando, Touchstone, Audrey, William).
Rosalind. O, my dear Orlando, how it grieves me
To see thee wear thy heart in a scarf! —V, ii.
Touchstone. I will kill thee a hundred and fifty ways;
Therefore, tremble, and depart. —V, i.

14. *Macbeth:* (Macbeth, Lady Macbeth, Three Witches).
Macbeth. If we should fail?
Lady Macbeth. We fail!
But screw your courage to the sticking place,
And we'll not fail. —I, vii.

15. *Comedy of Errors:* (The Two Antipholi, The Two Dromios, Adriana, Luciana).
Adriana. I see two husbands, or mine eyes deceive me.
Dromio of Ephesus. Me thinks you are my glass, and not my brother. —V, i.

16. *Othello:* (Othello, Desdemona, Iago).
Othello. I'm glad to see you mad.
Desdemona. How, sweet Othello?
Othello. Devil! —IV, i,

17. *Cymbeline:* (Iachimo, Leonatus, Imogen).
Iachimo. The heaviness and guilt within my bosom
Takes off my manhood. —V, ii.

18. *Measure for Measure:* (Angelo, Isabella).
Isabella. I will proclaim thee, Angelo, look for't. —II, iv.

19. *Winter's Tale:* (Leontes, Hermione, Florizel, Perdita).
Hermione. You gods, look down,
And from your sacred vials pour your graces
Upon my daughter's head. —V, iii.

20. *Tempest:* (Prospero, Miranda, Ariel, Caliban).
Prospero. What ho! slave! Caliban! Thou earth, thou, speak!
—I, ii.

21. *King John:* (King John, Salisbury, Pembroke, Essex).
King John. Why do you bend such solemn brows on me? —IV, ii.

22. *Richard II:*
Richard II. I have been studying how I may compare
This prison where I live, unto the world. —V, v.

23. 1 *Henry IV:*
Henry IV. And since this business so fair is done,
Let us not leave till all our own be won. —V, v.

24. *Henry V:* (Henry V, Catherine).
Henry V. An angel is like you, Kate, and you are like an angel.
—V, ii.

25. 3 *Henry VI:*
Henry VI. And, if the rest be true which I have heard,
Thou can'st——— —V, vi.

26. *Richard III:* (Richard III, Richmond).
Richard III. A horse! a horse! my kingdom for a horse! —V, iv.

27. *Henry VIII:* (Henry VIII, Queen Katherine, Wolsey, Anne Boleyn).
Queen Katherine. Sir, I do desire you do me right and justice.
—II, ii.

After the last of the last of the groups had appeared and filed into place at the side, William Shakespeare again presented himself before the Queen and knelt. The Queen then descended from her throne, and placed a wreath of laurel on his brow, after which she withdrew, and all the little actors followed.

The whole of the characters were exceedingly well-dressed in appro-

priate costumes, and went through their pantomimic action in a very effective manner, which elicited loud applause. The appearance of so large a number of children in such a diversity of character, had an exceedingly novel and picturesque appearance, and Mr. M. H. Simpson, the lessee of the theatre, has been everywhere complimented upon his very unique production. R.

Birmingham, 19th February.

Mr. Irving's Reading of Hamlet.—A *tour de force* was accomplished by Mr. Irving in giving on Wednesday evening (Feb. 23), before the Birkbeck Institute, a reading of the greater portion of *Hamlet*. Very moderate interest attends ordinarily the attempt to read a Shakespearian play. The readings of Miss Glyn are still pleasantly recalled, and individuals with long memories may recall those of Mrs. Kemble. A curious experiment was, moreover, attempted some years ago by the late J. C. M. Bellew, who gave with scenic and other embellishments, a rendering, half recitation, half performance, of *Hamlet*. From all these things, however, the feat accomplished by Mr. Irving differs. Standing behind a species of square column on which rested unused, what might have been and probably was, a first folio Shakespeare, he recited the greater part of the play, turning only in the case of subordinate characters to a small octavo volume of *Hamlet* which he brought in his hand. In the case of the characters generally, some attempt at impersonation was made; in the stronger scenes various parts were absolutely played. A feat more arduous in its class has seldom been accomplished, and Mr. Irving, though he did not falter or manifest signs of fatigue, grew perceptibly haggard before the conclusion was reached. Large portions were necessarily excised. The fourth act was omitted; the appearances of Ophelia were confined to the great scene with Hamlet and the play scene, with, of course the graveyard scene, in which her body is supposedly present. The parting of Laertes with his father and his sister, and the prayer of the King, were left out. From scenes that were played, moreover, portions of the dialogue were omitted. Mr. Irving's success was complete. Apart from the enthusiasm the read-

ing awoke in the audience, including many of his most devoted followers, it had signal interest for those most sceptical as to the value of this mode of illustration. Not only was the conception of Hamlet clearer and more convincing when the attention was concentrated upon delivery and facial play, and no distracting influence of scenery or pageantry was felt—other characters, even to the most subordinate, received an amount of illumination rarely accorded them. The character of Horatio is that, perhaps, on which the most light was thrown. Few play-goers can have obtained such insight into the personages frequently on the stage 'unknown or light esteemed,' as Mr. Irving, by mere recitation accompanied with slight, but significant gesture, constantly afforded. Polonius was also brightly interpreted, and what little there was of Ophelia was quietly, though effectively, rendered. The King, too, was well-played, and the grave-digger and Osric were excellent. It is to be regretted that the reading lasted longer than was anticipated, and towards the close Mr. Irving was disposed for the sake of his audience, to accelerate his pace. The whole was a highly intellectual treat, and the amount of emotion inspired in certain scenes was greater than has often attended a representation of *Hamlet* at the Lyceum.

—*The Athenæum.*

Adapting Shakespeare.—Madame Modjeska proposed to give Shakespeare translated from the original English into good Polish. The President agreed to this innovation, and Madame Modjeska arranged to play Juliet on her first benefit night. When she went to the assistant manager about it, he exclaimed, 'Oh, my dear Madame, it is impossible; it will not succeed. Plays that are *adapted from operas* never answer, I assure you!'—Collins's *Story of Helena Modjeska*, as quoted in *Actors and Actresses of the Present Time.*

Reviews.

> Observations,
> Which with experimental seal doth warrant
> The tenour of my book.
>
> —*Much Ado About Nothing*, IV, 1, 167.

*VICTOR HUGO AND SHAKESPEARE.**

THE life and fibre of Victor Hugo was his love for his kind. The trilogy of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity, was not carved more deeply upon Napoleon's façades by the Commune of 1870 than it was cut into his very soul. His muse dealt with the stateliest and the loftiest themes, with emperors and kings and the heights of tragedy as did Shakespeare's. But never did he miss, in its highest and stateliest, to speak a word for the proletariat and the poor, the masses in the faubourgs of poverty or the beggars at the gates. His ear listened and never lost the still sad music of humanity, and the cry of Triboulet,

> Come hither, look on her, I will not hinder,
> Tell me she is but swooning!

is just as poignant as that of Lear, 'Cordelia, stay a little!' although Lear was a king, and Triboulet but a jester who had naught to say when the king amused himself. However he blazoned his pages with courts and palaces, he never denied the right of every man to liberty and to bread, even at the cost of the red flag, the guillotine or the Commune. In *Les Miserables* he wrote the epic of poverty, and no more hesitated to spare himself in the cause of the masses than Jean Valjean hesitated to lay the white-hot metal upon his bare and quivering arm, in the Jondrette garret.

Shakespeare, on the other hand, never missed an opportunity to testify how he despised the people slurred, slandered and lampooned

* William Shakespeare. By Victor Hugo. Translated by Melville B. Anderson. Chicago. A. C. McClurg & Co. 1887.

them, denied their very right to lie side by side with men nobly born upon their country's battle fields. That the lowly has no right the lordly is bound to respect; the scriptural doctrine that to him that hath shall be given, while from him who hath not shall be taken away even that he hath; these are the only propositions upon which every one of Shakespeare's eight hundred personages agree: they speak their own thoughts (not Shakespeare's) as to everything else. But on these fundamentals they all preach in common, and always one way. Except in Adam (in *As You Like It*), Shakespeare never extols or praises virtue in anything less than a lord. But in Adam it is his willingness to give his noble master all his savings and to serve him without pay, that is pronounced commendable. In all Shakespeare, says Gov. Davis,—

> There is nowhere a hint of sympathy with personal rights as against the sovereign, nor with parliament, then first assuming its protective attitude towards the English people, nor with the few judges who, like Cooke, showed a glorious obstinacy in their resistance to the prerogative. In all his works there is not one direct word for liberty of speech, thought, religion—those rights which in his age were the very seeds of time, into which his eye, of all men's, could best look to see which grain would grow and which would not.

The doctrine of Coriolanus, says Hazlitt,—

> Is that those who have little shall have less, and those that have much shall take all that the others have left. The people are poor, therefore they ought to be starved, they work hard, therefore they ought to be treated like beasts of burden. They are ignorant, therefore they ought not to be allowed to feel that they want food or clothing or rest, or that they are enslaved or oppressed or miserable.

Says Gervinus,—

> Shakespeare had a leaning to the aristocratic principle, inasmuch as he does not dwell on the truth he tells of the nobles in the same proportion as he does on those he tells of the people.

'Lords! lords! lords! says Mr. Wilkes, 'and the people always and everywhere are scabs and hedge-born swains.' 'You will generally find that when a citizen is mentioned, he is made to do or say something absurd,' says Bagehot. Even in the comedies (where no political motive which can be construed as preaching that the people are better off if they suffer any indignity rather than meddle with the

order and sovereignty of class,) no opportunity is lost: 'Go bring the rabble' (*The Tempest*). Yet I have much to do to keep [the people] from uncivil outrages (*Two Gent. of Ver.*). 'What hempen homespuns have we swaggering here?' 'A crew of patches,' 'rude mechanicals that work for bread' (*Midsummer Night's Dream*). The sole title the reign of King John has to be remembered in history, is that it covers the grant of Magna Charta. Yet Shakespeare, in treating of that reign, never mentions it, but instead fills his pages with such fulsome lines as:—

> Ha, Majesty, how high thy glory towers
> When the rich blood of kings is set on fire!
> —II, i, 350.
> Out! dunghill, dar'st thou brave a nobleman?
> —IV, i, 87.

And even in *Richard II*, where opportunity for once, served to show that even kings were mortal, we have the moral twisted:—

> Not all the water in the rough rude sea
> Can wash the balm off from an anointed King;
> The breath of worldly men cannot depose
> The deputy elected by the Lord.
> —III, ii, 54.
> Darest thou, thou little better thing than earth
> Divine his downfall?
> —III, iv, 77.

In *1 Henry VI.*—A courtier prisoner of war refuses to be exchanged 'for base-born soldiers . . . who dare not take up arms like gentlemen.' And even in the stage directions, the people are brought in with such unnecessary stings as *enter the Edile with a rabble of citizens* (*Julius Cæsar*), or *enter Cade with all his rabblement* (*2 Henry VI*). It taxes the complaisancy even of a patrician, to read the stinging and scathing characterising in *Coriolanus*, of a people who have only so far forgotten themselves as to ask for bread, as—'your herd,' 'knaves that smell of sweat,' 'multiplying spawn,' 'herd of broils and plagues,' 'you common cry of curs' 'that reek of rotten fens,' 'their thick breaths rank of gross diet,'—'they'll sit by the fire and presume to know what's done in the capitol'—'these rats,' etc. Isabella and Portia plead eloquently for mercy, one for a noble youth and the other for a rich man who was evading the judgment of a court for money bor-

rowed: but where is mercy bespoken for a commoner in all these glowing pages? Had Shakespeare cared for the people, their liberties, their rights and interests (as I notice a late volume* insists that he did), surely he might have put into the mouth of one of his eight or nine hundred characters a statement, hint or suggestion to that effect. But I cannot find that he ever did.

In *1 Henry VI*, we have the King's order to bring back his 'annointed queen' from France, and for his

> 'xpenses and sufficient charge
> Among the people gather up a tenth.
>
> —V, v, 92.

A process which recalls the custom of the miners in California, who, when in need of pocket money, proceed to levy a tax upon any Chinamen in the vicinity. Nay, most of all, when a character is represented as searching a battlefield 'to sort our nobles from our common men,' lest 'our vulgar drench their peasant limbs in blood of princes' (*Henry V:* IV, vii, 77), one is tempted to ask with deference if the commonest sentiment of humanity would not suggest that, whether nobly or obscurely, by dying in their country's cause a nation's soldiery had not earned the merit of an equal grave?

All this is bad enough. But Shakespeare went further and lied—gloriously lied—in order to make the uprising of Cade a treason, and Joan of Arc not 'the virgin mother of French liberty' (as Gov. Davis says), but a traitress to her country. Great as he is, he shows a mendacity utterly unsurpassed in literature—as proportionally great as he is himself. Cade led a respectful deputation. The King sent to ask 'why the good men of Kent had left their homes.' Cade answered that the people were robbed of their goods for the King's use; that mean and corrupt persons, who plundered and oppressed the Commons, filled the high offices at court; that it was noised abroad that the King's lands in France had been aliened; that mis-government banished justice and prosperity from the land; and that the men of Kent were specially ill-treated and overtaxed, etc. The rebellion was against the nobles, not the King; Cade's demands were reasonable, as every English historian admits; and the throne treated with him, and proclaimed a truce upon

* *What we Really Know about Shakespeare*, p. 83. But I notice that Mrs. Dall (SHAKESPEARIANA, III, p. 173), admits that this is only her opinion.

his kingly honor, during which, Cade was treacherously murdered by he King's own party. But he is represented by Shakespeare, in a story manufactured out of whole cloth, not only as a rebel and a traitor, but a robber of orchards, and as being lawfully shot by one Alexander Iden, a Kentish gentleman, whose enclosed orchard Cade is attempting to burglarize. And so dies 'this monstrous traitor,' who not only committed no treason, but was *consulted* with by the throne as to needed reforms in the general weal! And what woman can forge Shakespeare's treatment of Joan of Arc: with all her self-denying patriotism, enthusiasm and achievements, called by every vile name in Shakespeare's great catalogue, represented as perishing with a lie upon her lips as to her birth, while a brutal English bishop stands by and sneers at her dying agonies, crying—

> Break thou in pieces and consume to ashes,
> Thou foul, accursed minister of hell!
>
> *1 Hen. VI:* V, iv, 92.

The further lie as to her condition of pregnancy (which, if true, even by English statutes would have entitled her to mercy) is not spared. But Shakespeare's plays must draw!

I know that the answer to this indictment is that Shakespeare loved his perquisites and theatrical concessions too well to imperil them by offending the courtiers who only had the legal right under Elizabeth's Statutes to license play houses; and that a playwright, making plays to be performed in London in a permanent theatre, must be careful not to interfere with questions of caste; that he had no charter at all, except from the protection and patronage of some particular nobleman (indeed, the law said, very explicitly, that without such an ægis he was a vagrant, a rogue by statute, and had no legal resting place except a gaol). But surely Shakespeare allowed his exuberance and respect for his own privileges to carry him a little too far in the case, at least, of Joan of Arc. Surely the grant of arms he purchased for his father would have won him the *soubriquet* of 'gentle' (though sometimes scholars forget the Elizabethan meaning of the word), without this!

It is one of the remarkable paradoxes of literature that two such politically antipodal men as Shakespeare and Victor Hugo should

have had so much in common, and that the last should have worshipped the first. Yet the book before us is a votive wreath.

M. Hugo's volume opens with a Proem in which we are shown the Hugos vomited, as Jonah from the deep—out of a volcano of fire and blood and tyranny—upon an island as free as Prospero's. At least the winds and waves were perfectly free to blow and beat and break upon it. The house in which they take shelter is bleak and square and colorless. But outside are the eternal ocean and the skurrying winds of heaven. To the brink of this ocean, Victor Hugo, the man of many human tempests, walks, and with the great breakers swarthing to his feet, and head bared to the great gusts, we find him communing with Shakespeare. Reckless, irregular, inaccurate in almost every detail of William Shakespeare's personal history, is this book. But the reader will thank heaven nevertheless, that M. Hugo wrote it on a barren island, and not locked up in a closet, surrounded with shelves full of encyclopædias, grammars and dictionaries. Had he been in that closet he might perhaps have made a tolerable commentator. He would have told us of scansion and of terminals, of run-on lines and stopped endings; perhaps of the influence of Ovid and Dionysius of Halicarnassus upon the skylarking youth from Stratford, or the substantial proprietor of two theatres in Elizabeth's London; we should have had much light as to genitive plurals and gerunds ending in *um;* been posted as to which of the thirty-seven plays superabounded in adjectives, and in which the adverbs outnumbered the participles. In that case M. Hugo would have been better equipped in his dates, and figures would not have danced so strangely on his pages. We would have had a forest of items about Shakespeare's income and the fate of his first-best bed, no doubt. But the winds of heaven would have whistled, and the ocean would have thundered in vain!

As it is, we have plenty of oxygen in motion. No inventories of syllables in *Hamlet*, nor rhymed lines in *Lear*, no numbering of the breakers that crashed at his feet, or triangulations of the curve of their curl! Here at least Shakespeare and the ocean alike are spotless from 'inductive criticism!' It as little occurred to Victor Hugo to supply Shakespeare with motives for creating Lear and Timon and Othello,

as with framing periods and groups in which their tragedies were composed. Voltaire called Shakespeare a barbarian, because he overlooked—if indeed he had ever heard of—the unities. Victor Hugo, with the spur of genius and the illness should attend it, overlooked not only the unities, but those pregnant crookings of the knee that bent to queens and lords that thrift should follow fawning, and worshipped like the rest of us; worshipped with the poorest of us all, the majesty that dominated then, as it still dominates, the world.

M. Hugo could not have been less careless with dates and documents, records and chronicles, had he realized as we do, that William Shakespeare not only never printed, but never authorized the printing of a single line of his divine works,—was as innocent of responsibility for the text of quarto or folio as was blind old Homer for the text of the Iliad that was never put on visible surface until ages after the seven cities fought for the honor of starving him in their streets—and therefore, that it is for these years, and not for those in which he lived, to stop and unstop his endings, and run on and run off his lines, and peep and botanize over what may be the poor printer's and not the great dramatist's tergiversations, for all we know or ever can discover.

Whether Shakespeare's plays were written in the order of the quartos, or were never written at all, but only sketched for the actors, and so actually printed before they were written; whether his first success led to the printing of his later pieces; or whether (in the days when literature came from wherever the Stationer's Company listed, and was doled out to the public with a preface telling them to applaud or approve—a prerogative that Pope was to imitate one hundred years later),—or whether Shakespeare was only a mask for a ring of courtiers:—considerations such as these do not detain M. Hugo in the volume before us one moment. We have here in their place—gratefully be it avowed—flights of what seem to me the very highest criticism which one poet ever passed upon another. There is no criticism of other critics. Nothing oracular as to the dramatist's reasons and motives, still less of tendency to question the right of other dogs to bark. Only apotheosis that leads us to wonder at the majesty of Hugo and to revise, perhaps, M. Hugo's own dictum of Æschylus (p. 149).

'Æschylus raises to Orpheus a temple of which he might occupy the altar himself!'

Appleton Morgan.

Literary Notes.

When comes your book forth?
Upon the heels of my presentment, sir.
—*Timon of Athens, I, i, 26.*

MR. HALLIWELL-PHILLIPPS'S new book is the product of the devoted search of a skilled and conscientious investigator, during twenty years, for every trace, in the town archives of England, of the visits of Shakespeare's company of actors.

The Visits of Shakespeare's Company of Actors to the Provincial Cities and Towns of England, illustrated by Extracts gathered from Corporate Records. By J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps, F. R. S. (Privately printed.)—*The Athenæum*, commenting on the work, gives the following account of ascertained facts of Shakespeare's stage life and of the further light, here and there, that Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps's research has been able to throw upon it:

On St. Stephen's Day (26th of Dec.), 1594, Shakespeare acted at Greenwich Palace before Queen Elizabeth. He was then associated with Kempe and Burbage, and belonged to the company of the Lord Chamberlain's Servants. To that company, which on the accession of James was distinguished as the Company of the King's Servants, he continued to belong till the end of his theatrical career. There is no evidence to show with what company or companies he was connected before December, 1594. We know that the Queen's players, and the players of Lords Essex, Leicester, and Stafford, visited Stratford-on-Avon in 1587; and it is highly probable that Shakespeare was at Stratford in that year, as his assent was required for the proposed relinquishing of the Ashbies estate. It has been confidently suggested that Shakespeare either joined Lord Leicester's players at Stratford in 1587, or repaired to London shortly afterwards, with the object of attaching himself to that particular company. But Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps, with scholarly prudence, declines to theorize in this fashion. What he has done is to search the corporate records for entries relating to the Lord Chamberlain's Servants, bearing date between December 26, 1594, and May 17, 1603, and from the latter date onwards to 1614, or there-

abouts, for entries relating to the King's Servants. Although he has met with no actual mention of Shakespeare, he has much to tell us about the perambulations of the company to which Shakespeare belonged, and with which, we may be sure, he often travelled. Oxford seems to have been the spot to which the company was most frequently drawn. Visits were paid to Oxford in 1604, 1605, 1606, 1607, 1610, and 1613. . . .

In 1605 the King's players went as far west as Barnstaple, and in the Chamberlain's accounts is the entry, 'Geven to the Kynges players, beynge in towne this year, X *s.*' . . . In 1603 they were at Bath, probably during the rejoicings occasioned by James's accession, and they received a grant of thirty shillings. The same sum was given them in September, 1597, for playing in the Guildhall at Bristol. From Bristol to Dover was a tolerably long journey in those days; and, if the whole company came to Dover in September, 1597, the reward of 'xiij. *s.* iiij. *d.*' can hardly be regarded as munificent.

But they were more handsomely treated at Dover in September, 1606, when they received no less than 2*l.* At Folkestone on September 8, 1612, they were rewarded with the paltry sum of 'ij.*s.*'; but Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps generously suggests that the unusually small amount of payment here recorded leads one to suspect an error in the accounts for 'ij. *li.*' . . . At Saffron Walden, the home of Gabriel Harvey, in 1605–6, they received only 6*s.* 8*d.* To Shrewsbury they were frequent visitors; they were there in 1603, 1609, 1610, and 1612. On two occasions they were at New Romney, first in May, 1609, and again in April, 1612.

In the summer of 1606 they visited Leicester, and in the Chamberlain's accounts is the entry, 'Item in August, geven to the Kinges Majesties Playars, xl. *s.*'; but the entry is cancelled, and in the margin is added a stern '*quer.*,' which plainly shows that the auditors were not disposed to sanction the payment without a protest.

One most curious fact has been brought to light by Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps's researches, namely, that Sir Thomas Lucy actually had under his patronage a company of itinerant actors. We should never have suspected that the grim old Puritan encouraged such 'caterpillars of a commonwealth;' but in the Chamberlain's accounts at Coventry for 1584, is the entry, 'To Sir Thomas Lucy's players, x *s.*'

It probably will not be long before another volume shall be ready to take its place in that magnificent and beneficent series of the Plays of Shakespeare — The Furness *Variorum* — which gathers up in its text with a faithful, painstaking, and liberal hand the results of past scholarship, and in the commentaries added, collects with wide knowledge and discriminating judgment everything it is good to know of in connection with the play, in whatsoever light the many-faceted dramatic gem may be regarded. The collation of texts and readings

for the coming volume—*The Merchant of Venice*—proceeded with ease and swiftness after the work on its predecessor, *Othello*, published last April, was completed, so that it looked almost within likelihood to get the new book out within the same year, but the labor connected with the latter part of the work, which is so full of interest and value to others than amendors and students of the bare text, had to be followed more slowly.

In the meantime, a second edition of *Othello* has been called for, and the opportunity is taken to correct some few slight misprints in the first edition.

The first two volumes of the promised *Mermaid Series*, the best plays, unexpurgated, of the old English dramatists, are now ready, and may be had of Messrs. Vizetelly & Co., of London, or Scribner & Welford, New York. Kit. Marlowe, the subject of the first volume, receives prefatory consideration, critical and biographical, from the editor of the series, Mr. Havelock Ellis; and to this initial volume Mr. J. A. Symonds prefixes a general introduction, covering the ground of dramatic literature to be brought before us in these successive volumes with all the freshness and seduction that new types and scholarly editing may confer. To Marlowe, and to Massinger who is the second figure in the Mermaid procession, Middleton will succeed and his attendant sprite will be a modern poet—Mr. A. C. Swinburne—whose literary insight and ardor, before now, has made his expression of his knowledge and estimate of the dramatic art of the times peculiarly attractive reading. The Middleton-Swinburne volume will be issued this month. The eighth work of this series to be edited by Mr. Arthur Symons, who also edits the Massinger volume, will contain *Arden of Feversham* and other tales attributed to Shakespeare.

Messrs. Macmillan & Co. will publish soon Mr. Morley's recent address on the Study of Literature. The notes from which he spoke will be expanded and some new points introduced.

The New York Shakespeare Society will have some new music, suggested by thoughts of the great dramatist, especially dedicated to

it. The composer is Mr. M. Appleton Baker, of New York, who has written several other musical pieces; and his work will be called *The King Lear March.*

A pretty little book cased in gray boards with a red back, and called *Shakespeare Indexes,* comes to do an office for Shakespeare Reading Clubs, that they may find of frequent convenience. The maker of the two indexes the book contains, says it has been one of his duties, for some years, to cast the plays read in the club to which he belongs; he has known all the difficulties incident to the distribution among a few readers of the many parts of a populous drama, and in order not to require any one person 'to be "three gentlemen at once," like Mrs. Malaprop's Cerberus, or a round dozen, like Pooh Bah, the pluralist of Titipu,' he has found it advisable to set down the tables of the *dramatis personæ,* and lists of the personages with the act and scene where each one appears, noted alongside, and thence has been able at a glance, to allot and combine the necessary parts at pleasure.

The first index is made up of such tables of all the plays, in the order in which they usually appear in standard editions. The second index is an alphabetical list of all the characters—except those who are referred to, but do not come upon the stage at all—telling who they are and in what play, act, and scene they appear. The work seems to have been accurately done. (Published in York by John Sampson & Co., London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co., 1887. 116 pp. Price, 1*s.* 6*d.*)

Miscellany.

To knit again
This scattered corn into one mutual sheaf.
—*Titus Andronicus*, V, iii, 70.

RICHARD III.—At the meeting of the Royal Society of Literature, in London, two days after Mr. Lowell's Chicago address, a paper was read by Mr. F. Palmer on *Richard III* as showing the adolescence of Shakespeare's genius. After giving a summary of the metrical and other tests which, it is generally allowed, point to this play as being one of Shakespeare's earliest works, he went on to say that the psychological aspect of the play led to the same conclusion, presenting all the hyperbolical intensity characteristic of a youthful writer, besides showing signs of an increasing independence of thought, and a throwing off of earlier surrounding influences. The character of Richard highly colored and out-standing, but deficient in refinement of shading, held a middle place between the earlier and later methods of Shakespeare. Dr. Knighton, on the other hand, argued that the data Mr. Palmer cited, tended to show the play was the work of a mature rather than an adolescent writer. Mr. Highton claimed that Shakespeare's intention was dramatic rather than psychological; that the facts of history limited his treatment of the characters; and that his development of the female characters was in strict accordance with these facts. Richard himself was by no means the dramatic 'be-all and end-all' of the play, and had only been made so by the desire of the actors of the part to fill the stage.

THE NEW YORK SCHOOL OF ACTING.—An exhibition of the work of this Dramatic School was given in New York on the afternoon of March 16, and on the 23d of last month, a matinée performance of several short pieces, including an adaptation of Molière's *Les*

Precieuses Ridicules. The high aim which inspires the management of the School is leading it steadily on in better work and larger accomplishment, and now in its fourth year it has an established right to claim the notice and encouragement of all lovers of genuine and legitimate dramatic art. (For a succinct and authoritative account of this School, see SHAKESPEARIANA for October, '86, pp 466-70.) Professor Franklin H. Sargent, its able and well-known director, writes us that he has in mind the production of a complete play of Shakespeare, cast from the students of the School. There can be no question but that the study of the play necessary would be an inspiring force for all the students engaged in it, and there can be no Shakespearian who hears of the project but will wish Prof. Sargent may carry it to a successful issue.

THE NAME SHAKESPEARE.—'It seems to me very unlikely,' writes Mr. Henry Bradley to the *Academy* of Feb. 5th, 'that the surname made illustrious by our great poet, originally meant "Spear-shaker." Probably it was an etymologising distortion of something more in accordance with the analogies of English family nomenclature. I venture to suggest that it may be derived from the Anglo-Saxon personal name, Scaxberht, and that the well-known form "Shaxberd," instead of being a mere blunder, was a colloquial survival of the original name, which the family, so-called preferred, at least in writing, to render in a manner suggested by its assumed etymology. There are many unquestionable instances in which Anglo-Saxon personal names, other than those retained as Christian names, in later times have left traces in family nomenclature. The surnames, Winfarthing and Allfarthing, for example, are clearly derived from the names Wineferht and Ealferhth. There seems, therefore, to be no intrinsic improbability in the suggestion here put forward, though, of course, any actual proof of its correctness is out of the question.'

MADCAP HARRY AND SIR JOHN POPHAM.—It is well known by students of history that Shakespeare's character of Prince Henry, afterward Henry V., is a gross libel upon one whose personal life was

singularly pure and upright. I am not quite clear that the prince can be exonerated entirely from robbing the king's mails; but he had this excuse, that his father withheld from him his income as Prince of Wales, partly from innate meanness, but more, perhaps, from the jealousy inherent in such natures toward his next heir—one who utterly surpassed him in nobleness of mind and popular gifts.

Who, then, was the original of Shakespeare's Madcap Harry? If I mistake not, he is to be found in Sir John Popham, sometime speaker of the House of Commons and Lord Chief Justice of England. At the time that Shakespeare was writing his plays and residing at Bankside, in Southwark, the circumstances with which he credits Prince Henry were being enacted in the borough, probably before his very eyes.

Sir John Popham was a native of Somerset. How far his being stolen by gypsies when a child and remaining with them some months, gave him a taste for a vagabond or Bohemian way of life, one cannot say. At Baliol College, Oxford, he bore a high character, and is said to have laid in a good stock of classical learning and dogmatical divinity, but on removing to the Middle Temple he appears to have fallen in bad company and utterly neglected his judicial studies.—Charlotte G. Bager in *Walford's Antiquarian* for Jan.

A New Portrait.—Mr. Sam: Timmins in a private letter lately received, mentions a recent visit to Stratford. Of course he visited the Church, and the Memorial Hall, and all the familiar haunts. The Guildhall School he found in session and filled with young natives of Warwickshire, thronging in the places where once sat their compatriots —the boy Shakespeare and his forgotten chums. At the Birth-place he saw on an easel, prominently placed, a picture they had to tell him, since it bore no resemblance to suggest the possibility, was a new-discovered portrait of Shakespeare. 'The canvas is fresh varnished and the frame new-gilt, but it won't do,' is his comment.

English Edition.

THE SCOTTISH REVIEW.

$3.00 a Year; 90 cts. a Number.

Under an arrangement with the Publisher, this Company assume exclusive control of the American issue, from original sheets with the number for January, 1887.

THE SCOTTISH REVIEW

Has been in existence four years, and has won for itself a recognized position as an Independent Organ for the expression of Literary and Public Opinion.

It is the only Scottish Quarterly, and considerable space is therefore regularly devoted to peculiarly Scottish Questions and History.

Special attention is paid to the National Literature. A Popular or Scientific Article dealing either with the Gaelic or Teutonic Language of the Country, their affinities and literary remains, will appear in each issue.

Colonial and Imperial matters of interest are freely discussed in its pages from different points of view.

Current Literature is reviewed both in Extended Articles and in Short Notices.

It is, moreover, endeavoured, by occasional Articles by Foreigners or from Foreign sources, to afford the reader a knowledge and appreciation of Foreign Views upon Historical, Social and Political, as well as Literary Questions.

The leading Continental Reviews and Magazines—French, German, Italian Dutch, Russian—are Summarized each Quarter.

Many of its articles will cover the ground lately occupied by the British Quarterly Review.

SPECIAL RATES WITH THE EDINBURGH AND QUARTERLY REVIEWS.

Edinburgh Review and Scottish Review, . . .	(to one address),	$4 50
Quarterly Review and Scottish Review, ...	"	4 50
Edinburgh Review, Quarterly Review and Scottish Review,	"	7 50

LEONARD SCOTT PUBLICATION CO.

SAM'L P. FERREE, Treas. 1104 WALNUT ST., PHILADELPHIA.

English Editions.

With the issues for January, 1887, the LEONARD SCOTT PUBLICATION COMPANY will furnish its Subscribers with original sheets of the

Fortnightly Review, and the Contemporary Review. The Nineteenth Century, will be issued to correspond.

No American, desirous of keeping abreast of the times, can afford to be without these three great English Monthly Reviews. Their contributors comprise the foremost and ablest writers of the World, and their contents treat of the latest and most important phases of modern thought.

Terms : $4.50 each; any two, $8.50; all three, $12.00.

Scottish Review. Under an arrangement with the English publisher, this Company assumes exclusive control of the American issue.

Terms: $3.00 a year; Single Numbers, 90 Cents.

Edinburgh Review. Quarterly Review. We take great pleasure in announcing that we shall continue the issue in America of these two English Quarterlies, and offer special terms with the Scottish Review.

Terms. $3.00 each; or, $5.50 for the two.

Edinburgh or Quarterly Review with Scottish Review, $4 50

Edinburgh and Quarterly Review with Scottish Review, 7 50

Westminster Review. Many of the most advanced of modern theories in theology have in its pages received their first authoritative support. Its "INDEPENDENT SECTION" contains articles advocating views at variance with those of its editors.

Blackwood's Magazine. Is the leading and most popular monthly of Great Britain. The tone of its articles is unexceptionable, rendering it most desirable for the Home Circle.

Terms: $3.00 each; any two, $5.50; any three, $8.00; any four, $10.50; all five, $13.00.

—AN AMERICAN MONTHLY.—

Shakespeariana. While aiming to furnish a medium for the interchange of views among scholars, and to afford the student the fullest information relative to Shakespeare's art, life and writings, it is specially designed to extend the influence of Shakespeare as a popular educator.

Terms : $1.50; 15 cents per Number.

All Post Paid through United States and Canada.

Leonard Scott Publication Co.,

1104 Walnut Street, Philadelphia.

SAM'L P. FERREE, Treas.

Printed at the Ferree Press, Fifth and Chestnut Streets, Phila.